

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. LXXV.]

MARCH, 1851.

[VOL. VII.

DR. PRIESTLEY.*

LETTER XVI.

Mr. Wilkinson to Dr. Priestley.

Dear Sir,—I accord entirely with the sentiments contained in yours of the 4th, and have remitted Mr. Vaughan £5000 to purchase stock in a country which appears to me most likely to become the place of refuge from persecution in religious matters, as it will be of advantage to those engaged in manufactures and commerce, which will always flourish *most* where Church and King interfere least.

I observe you have had flattering invitations to remove into a situation of safety compared to that you are in on this side the water. Were I in your case, I should not hesitate long where to fix. It is pretty evident to me that there are bigots in *this* country, who think it would be of service to what they call our holy religion to have you destroyed by any means. How far you are out of their reach where you now are, I am unable to determine; but I am of this opinion, that the spirit which at present seems to reign could not affect you in its operations in France as it may do in this country, and that I should join in opinion with the *timid* part of your intended congregation. I return into the North again all this month to superintend some planting that I have to finish at Castle-head, in which I have noted on transplanting that where a tree is to be removed, the longer it is delayed and the older the plant, the greater is the difficulty of getting it to take root. * * *

I am, dear Sir, ever yours,

J. W.

LETTER XVII.

Dr. Priestley to Mr. Wilkinson.

Dear Sir,—I wish to put into your hands my Appeal to the Public in its present state. Several of my friends in Birmingham wish to have it either suppressed or much softened, but my friends here approve of it as it now is. I want to know how it strikes *you*. In my own opinion, if I write at all, it ought not to be with less spirit than I have usually shewn, and there are as bold and offensive things in several of my former publications as in this. However, if cancelling a few leaves will satisfy my friends, I shall have no objection to do it. The publication will be in good time, if it be about the meeting of Parliament.

I have desired the printer (Thompson, Birmingham) to send you a copy, *carefully sealed*, to Broseley, with directions *to be forwarded to*

* Continued from p. 108.

you without delay, so that I hope you will soon receive it, and as it is not to be published in its present state, you will return the copy to me. But this will do when you come to London, which I hope will be ere long. I have got into the house I have taken at Clapton. It was an old one, and in greater want of repair than I was aware of; but with some expense I hope it will prove a comfortable one. If it was not that I must have room for a library and laboratory, it is larger than I ought to have; but without room for these things, though they be expensive, I am useless; and the few years of active life that, according to the course of nature, I may yet enjoy, I wish to make the most of. I proposed to my congregation at Birmingham to go down and preach to them till Christmas, but they thought it unsafe, and last Sunday Mr. Coates delivered the sermon that I had composed for the opening of the new temporary place, which was a riding-school. On Sunday se'nnight I begin to preach at Hackney; but the fears of many of the congregation are not yet wholly vanished.

I am now unpacking such of my books and papers as my friends have been able to save from the general wreck, and it is indeed affecting to see the shocking havoc that has been made of them, though more things are preserved than I could have expected.

Your sister joins in best respects to yourself and Mrs. Wilkinson, and in wishes to see you in our new habitation. You were the means of fixing us in the last, and while we continued in it, we never were more happy. At present, things look tolerably promising here, but nothing is to be depended upon. I meet with difficulties in settling William in France, but I hope to succeed in the end. Yours sincerely,

J. PRIESTLEY.

LETTER XVIII.

To the Same.

Dear Sir,—I agree (*with*) you that the reasoning of the Attorney-General about your use of the *assignats* was foolish enough, but it appears to me to be a fair specimen of their reasoning and conduct in more important things. I dined on Saturday in company with Mr. Sheridan and some other politicians. It appeared very evident that our Court had no expectation of the French declaring war in consequence of the dismissal of M. Chauvelir, and it is now a general opinion that they are now endeavouring, in some circuitous way, to make peace before any considerable blow is struck. That the French do not fear the war is evident enough. * * *

You may justly think yourself happy in being out of the *mania*, as you properly call it, that prevails here. I really begin to think myself not quite safe. I can give you no idea of the rancour that is now more than ever prevalent against me, as it shews itself in hand-bills and every other way calculated to excite mischief. However, I keep myself as quiet as I can, and perhaps in time the storm may blow over. Your sister, who never was alarmed before, begins to be so now, and, if my sons can get settled in France or America, will have less objection to follow them than she had some time ago. She is much concerned for William, from whom we have not heard a considerable time. A Spanish grandee has a letter from him to me, and has a great desire to see me, but being much with the Prince of Wales and at Court, finds he cannot

do it. He might, however, send me the letter. But it is probably only a letter of introduction. * * *

Endorsed, Feb. 18, 1793.

LETTER XIX.

To the Same.

Dear Sir,—Having nothing of particular consequence to send you, I enclose a few copies of a *Letter* I was advised to write in answer to what Mr. Burke said of me in the House of Commons. I hear he is very much provoked at it, but I do not find he will make any reply. He likewise mentioned the name of Dr. Rees as one who had corresponded with the French, and *he* has published a reply, but I have no copy of it.

I have a letter from William very much in the same strain with that of his to Mr. Jukes. He will go for America as soon as he can, and I hope he is at sea by this time. He might have gone before, but he thought the price of conveyance too great. What he can do when he gets thither I cannot tell; but there was no other choice for him. No son of mine can ever settle in this country, unless things should take a turn that we have no reason to expect.

I sent William twenty-seven of the *assignats* you were so good as to send me, and he received them and was very thankful for them; but as I can make no particular use of any more, you had better keep those you have till better times. I consider the £500 I have in the French funds as lost, and am thankful that the little I am worth is in the American funds, though but little can be made of the interest in this country.

The new law that is to be made about correspondence with France appears very unreasonable and unnecessary, but it cannot affect purchases already made in England; but it will effectually prevent any person going to or coming from that country, except with the approbation of the Court.

Your sister is a good deal better, but much distressed about getting servants. Our cook-maid is just married, and the other is to be so soon, and so violent is the spirit of party, that it is hardly possible to get a servant, and those we have are exposed to so much abuse from the neighbours of the lower class, that it is as much as they can bear. I have proposed to her to give over housekeeping for a time, as Sally wants her mother against her time of confinement, and I can be in the college in the mean time; but she does not incline to it.

Clapton, March 19, 1793.

J. PRIESTLEY.

LETTER XX.

To the Same.

Clapton, April 6, 1793.

Dear Sir,—As you were pleased with a small pamphlet I sent you of Mr. William Fox, I now enclose another, and hope it will meet you about the time of your return to Castle-head, where I hope you will enjoy a retirement that is now truly enviable. Here everybody is in a state of distress and alarm. The like, it is said, was never known before among persons in trade, and the evil is thought to be not yet at its height. The war, however, is pursued with more vigour than ever, and the retreat of the French from Flanders gives the Court party the full expectation of conquering France and restoring monarchy there in the course of this campaign.

All communication with France being now cut off, I am much concerned about William, but I hope he is by this time on his way to America, where he is to meet his brother, Joseph intending to leave this country in July, and as Harry is inclined to go with him, I have consented. As he chooses an active employment rather than a profession, and several of his companions in the college are going to occupy lands in America, he wishes to do the same, and as Mr. Vaughan's sons will take him under their care for a time, and prepare him for either agriculture or commerce, I think I cannot place him better, and he is of a very proper age for the purpose. At all events, no son of mine can settle to any advantage in this country, if it was ever so desirable on other accounts. To send them all to such a distance is far from being desirable, but I believe it is the best for *them*, considering the present and probably future state of this country. Joseph urges me strongly to go with them, but I must see them settled first, and then it will go hard with me, and especially your sister, to leave Sally. Joseph's wife is delivered of a fine boy, and he only waits for her recovery.

All these things make us anxious, especially as your sister has been dangerously ill with spitting blood and a feverish complaint. * * *

LETTER XXI.

To the Same.

Clapton, May 2, 1793.

Dear Sir,—I have no news to send you but that the alarm about paper credit increases, and the debate on the subject in Parliament is not likely to diminish it, as by this means both the great magnitude of the evil and the inadequateness of the remedy are rendered more striking. * * * Many cautious people are getting a little cash as a resource against a possible event. Indeed, the alarm is such as to lead many persons to think of it, and if this proceed, coin will disappear in this country as it has done in France. * * *

LETTER XXII.

To the Same.

Clapton, May 16, 1793.

Dear Sir,—After a state of much anxiety, we have at length heard from William, and I enclose the letter. I hope he is by this time safely arrived in America. France, I fear, will long be in a lamentable state. I have no fear on account of their foreign enemies, but their dissensions among themselves. When all my sons are settled in America, I do not think I shall stay long after them, especially if a scheme that my son says is talked of, of establishing a liberal college in the back settlements of America, should be carried into execution. In this case I would go soon, and devote myself wholly to it. My own library (to which Mr. Lindsey will add his) and apparatus will make a good beginning. The colleges they have in the old towns were in a great measure, I believe, founded by Englishmen, and I do not think men of fortune can perpetuate their names more effectually or usefully than by such foundations in such a country as America.

The college here is likely to fail for want of sufficient support, and the money contributed to it has been laid out so improvidently, that few persons will be disposed to give it any assistance. * * *

In a letter to the same (franked, June 4, 1793, by B. Vaughan), Dr. Priestley, after alluding to the embarrassed affairs of his son-in-law, Finch, and his determination not to leave England for America, continues,

"I cannot help, however, being a little anxious, and perhaps *this* and similar things have brought a return of my gall-stone complaint, which I could wish to counteract by a journey, but I am not at present at liberty. I believe I must once more have recourse to my vegetable diet."

LETTER XXIV.

To the Same.

Clapton, June 20, 1793.

Dear Sir,—As you may not have a good opportunity of seeing an account of the debate on Mr. Fox's late motion, and it may assist you in forming a judgment of the temper of the Court and of the nation with respect to the war, I enclose the Morning Chronicle which contains it. You will see by it that there is no prospect of a speedy peace except from the distressed state of France disabling it from continuing the war, and on this I imagine our most sanguine hopes are founded. Indeed, the prospect of things at home and abroad is peculiarly dark and discouraging. I see no source of consolation but in my firm faith in an overruling Providence which brings good out of all evil. I am not apt to despond, but I own this state of things, and the prospect of being separated, I know not how long, perhaps for life, from all my sons, together with the return of my old gall-stone complaint, disposes me a little to melancholy at times, though I exert myself to drive it off. * * *

I am determined not to remove at present. Emigration is very well for young persons, but does not so well suit persons in years, whose habits are more confirmed.

LETTER XXV.

To the Same.

July 3, 1793.

* * * You must not be surprised if I accept of your kind invitation to Castle-head part of the time that you will be there. I really want a journey, not having stirred from the spot for two years, though I used to make two excursions every year, and there is no place in the world in which I enjoyed myself so much as your hall and that neighbourhood. Here I am unavoidably too much in the world, and there I seemed to be quite out of it, and could read or compose with a tranquillity that I never felt in the same degree any where else. But Mr. Russell presses me much to spend some time with him at his new house near Gloucester, and Castle-head being so very far off, I really do not know which way to go. I thank God, that though I cannot go to Birmingham or Heath, I have invitations to go to several other places, particularly to Ipswich and Norwich, but I prefer a retirement in the country.

LETTER XXVI.

To the Same.

Dated Clapton, July 15, 1793.

Dr. Priestley says he is setting off that day for Gloucester, to spend a week or ten days with Mr. Russell. In the P.S. he writes, "Two

years are now elapsed since the riot, and I hear of no compensation as yet. Mr. Russell, I hope, will be able to give me some information about it. Expecting it soon, I have empowered Mr. Vaughan, of Philadelphia, to draw for it and place it in the American funds."

LETTER XXVII.

To the Same.

Dated Clapton, Aug. 19, 1793.

After some observations on the French war and a rumoured rupture with America, Dr. P. continues,—The war evidently becomes more unpopular. An illumination was much wished for on Friday last, the birth-day of the Duke of York, but none took place.

In the mean time the Court remits nothing of its violence. Mr. Walker, of Manchester, has a bill found against him for training men to join the French, and using seditious language. Several others are included in the same charge. They are to be tried the next assizes. The principal evidence, however, is a man of infamous character whom they hope to convict of perjury.

The ship that my sons go in is to sail down the river on Wednesday, and they mean to go on board at Gravesend on Saturday next. It is crowded with passengers, as is every other ship that sails for America.

LETTER XXVIII.

To the Same.

About Sept., 1793, in pencil.

* * * Mr. Vaughan's letter will tell you what he thinks of the intended purchase. I have not, however, complied with his request; because if I had, and nothing could be got from France, I should have nothing to subsist on when I get to America. I have desired him to lay out £2000, which I mean for the use of William and Harry. I give up something more than £300 per annum in leaving this country, and what employment I shall be able to get there is uncertain. It will probably be in some of their colleges, for I cannot expect to get anything as a preacher, at least for some time, and on account of my age it could not continue long. As a lecturer I may hold out longer. To abandon an advantageous and agreeable situation for such an uncertainty so late in life is sometimes rather painful, but it is absolutely necessary, and I trust in that good Providence which has attended me hitherto, and on my own exertions. If what you have generously given me in the French funds yields anything near its value, I shall be quite easy. To make this more secure, I have been with the American ambassador to acquaint him that I am going to settle in America as a citizen of the United States. This he is to transmit to France, which it is thought will secure my property there. He thinks there will be no American war, unless the combined powers succeed against France. There are, however, he says, some in the Cabinet here, who wish to provoke the Americans to hostility, thinking it better to have them open enemies than, as they believe them to be, secret ones. The piracies of the Algerines, he says, were certainly produced by the English consul at Algiers.

As all my friends advise me to go as soon as I can, I have taken my

passage in a vessel that is just arrived from *New York*, and purposes to sail again the middle of the next month, but it will probably not be till the end of it or the beginning of the month following, so that I hope we shall have the satisfaction of seeing you before we go. Mr. Finch and Sally we expect next Wednesday. How long they will stay, I do not know. Mr. and Mrs. Galton would come, but as business makes it impossible for him to leave Birmingham, they desire us to meet them and spend a day with them at Oxford, which I imagine we shall do, but the time is not fixed.

On Monday I begin to pack my apparatus, but as it is material to the disposal of the house that it should make as handsome an appearance as it can, I shall not pack my books till some time hence, and the furniture we shall keep to the last.

LETTER XXIX.

To the Same.

Clapton, Dec. 2, 1793.

I enclose a philosophical article that I have just published. Nothing I have done is thought by my friends to be of more consequence than this, though it is not probable that any practical use can be made of the discovery. Having everything now ready to resume my former pursuits, and beginning with so much advantage, it gives me, I own, some concern to break up so soon as I probably must.

The (*times*) grow darker and darker. What affects me (*most*) are the proceedings in the case of Mr. Winterbottom. It shews that no man who is obnoxious, however innocent, is safe.

LETTER XXX.

To the Same.

London, January 9, 1794.

* * * Mr. Drowley was a Baptist minister in England, but in America he is merely a farmer. He said before he went that the greatest part of his congregation meant to follow him. There called upon me lately a gentleman from Leicester, who is going, as agent to five congregations and many others in that neighbourhood, to make provision for their easy emigration, and to find every man suitable employment, whether as farmer or manufacturer, as soon as he arrives.

But there is cloud over our schemes of emigration by the renewed apprehension of an *American war*. One person from Philadelphia, with whom I dined yesterday, said he thought the people would not bear the restrictions on their commerce imposed by this country. Sixteen Algerine privateers were lately off Cadiz cruising against the Americans, as it is not doubted here, and believed by all the Americans, with the encouragement of this court. I therefore fear that a war is inevitable; but happily the two countries are at a distance, and much time must be spent in negotiation.

* * * The person who brought me Mr. Drowley's letter said there was an Address to me, signed by the principal gentlemen of New York, encouraging me to settle with them, and, as he thought, requesting me to undertake some department in their *college*. I have not yet received it. If I do, I shall not hesitate to accept it, as that would make my leaving this country both more easy and more acceptable.

LETTER XXXI.

To the Same.

Jan. 25, 1794.

* * * Violent as the Ministry are, I much fear there is as violent a spirit of opposition rising up in many of the *lower orders*, which threatens something even worse; while persons of property and moderation will not be heard, but will be in danger of being crushed by both. The calmest of my friends are more alarmed than ever.

The scheme of buying a tract of land is Mr. Vaughan's, who, as he lives in America, is the best judge of it, and as he himself embarks as a principal, I am disposed to think well of it. * * *

Having now come to a full determination to leave this country, I wish to go as soon as we conveniently can, and that we think may be in the April packet.

LETTER XXXII.

To the Same.

Clapton, Feb. 7, 1794.

Dear Sir,—Yesterday Mr. Russell and his daughters arrived at our house, and are to be our guests some time. They will soon, however, go to Mr. Vaughan's. * * *

We must leave the house towards the end of March, and shall be busy in packing. While the house is habitable, however, we shall be most happy to receive you in it, and we hope you will, as it may be the last time of our seeing you, make it as long as you can.

I do not pretend to leave this country, where I have lived so long and so happily, without regret, but I consider it as necessary; and I hope that the same good Providence that has attended me hitherto, will attend me still.

I am preaching, and at the same time printing, a set of Discourses on the Evidences of Revelation, and in the Preface to them, or to a Fast Sermon which I shall publish, I propose to take leave of this country.

Mr. Vaughan says he perceives the Ministry, and especially Mr. Dundas, who, he says, has more sense than any of them, are by no means in good spirits. They have, as you observe, missed their road, but may not so easily get into it again.

Sincerely wishing, but not expecting, better prospects, I am, dear Sir, most sincerely yours,

J. PRIESTLEY.

P.S. Your sister and all with us join in best respects to you. Mr. Finch, I find, has settled with your brother, and disposed of his property, &c., in Dudley. Nothing remains but the lease of the house, &c., so that Sally writes in rather better spirits.

LETTER XXXIII.

To the Same.

New York, June 14, 1794.

Dear Sir,—We had, upon the whole, a good passage, and arrived safe and in good health here on the 4th inst. We were sick and much indisposed, especially your sister, till within about three weeks of our arrival, when we both got very well. We were much delayed by contrary winds, and when we got to the coast of America, had thick fogs and rain, which they say are very unusual here at this time of the year. Joseph was here to receive us. He is now gone to look after a settle-

ment, and William, who had not seen New York, is now with us. They both desire to be remembered to you, and Joseph says he wrote to you, and by his account the letter could not reach you till after we left England.

I have been received here in a manner very flattering to me, almost every person of consequence in the place having visited me, and many addresses having been presented to me, which, with my answers, are printed in their newspapers, and circulated through the continent. This is rather troublesome to me, but could not be avoided.

Wanting money, and finding the exchange greatly in favour of the drawer (being little less than nine per cent., a thing never known before), I have taken the liberty to draw upon Mr. Hammet* for the *two hundred pounds* you were so kind as to say you would allow me till the money in the French funds came to be productive. I hear they make no payments at present to any who are out of the country, and who do not contribute some way or other to the defence of the country. However, when I get to Philadelphia, I shall see the French ambassador, and hope that a proper memorial of my particular case may be attended to. I am happy to find that the embargo which was laid on all American ships in France is now taken off, and the communication between the two countries once more open, so that perhaps the interest of the money, that in the funds at least, may be remitted in French produce.

We are very anxious to hear news from England, as everybody here expects a war with England, if the combined powers succeed against France. You will therefore easily judge which side they take. Indeed, they are full of indignation against England, and making preparations for war. They are now fortifying the town, or rather the harbour, and the back settlers can hardly be prevented by the Government from attacking the forts retained contrary to the treaty by the English, and likewise the Spanish settlements at the mouth of the Mississippi. I shall write again the first opportunity from Philadelphia, and am, with your sister's love to yourself and Mrs. Wilkinson, dear Sir, yours sincerely,
J. PRIESTLEY.

LETTER XXXIV.

To the Same.

Philadelphia, June 27, 1794.

Dear Sir,—We have now been here a week, and I can give you a better account of our probable destination than I could do before. I have been received with the most flattering attention by all persons of note, as I was at New York, which, though troublesome, promises well with respect to my settlement in the country. I am much pressed to take a house and reside in this city; but the expense of living here is so high, that I could not well do it, without giving lectures or binding myself to some employment which would interfere with my philosophical and other pursuits; whereas, if I reside in Northumberland, the country-town the nearest to our proposed settlement, the expense will be much less, and I shall have more leisure. Besides, your sister, as well as myself, dislikes being in such a city as this. We want no more society than we shall have among ourselves at Northumberland, and I can reside a month or two every year in this city during the sitting of Con-

* This name is obscurely written.—ED. C. R.

gress, which will in all respects answer as good purpose as living constantly here. The greatest objection relates to the difficulty and expense of getting all my packages from this place to Northumberland. But the expense will be compensated by the difference of expense in one year's living. Besides that provisions are as dear in this place as in London, house-rent and firing are much higher. Such a house as I have generally lived in in England, would be here at least £150 sterling per annum, and the firing would be about half as much, but then the taxes are inconsiderable. At Northumberland as good a house will not exceed £30 per annum, and firing will cost nothing but the cutting of the wood, and provisions about one-half. It is to be feared, however, that the high price of everything will gradually extend to the country. The rise of prices, or depreciation of money, has been cent. per cent. in little more than two years, owing, it is supposed, chiefly to the introduction of paper money. This circumstance has had an extraordinary effect in quickening the industry of the country, making it highly advantageous to the man who has anything to sell, but hard upon the man who must buy.

Everything will be abundantly easy to me, if I can secure the property you generously gave me in the French funds, and I have taken the best measures I can for the purpose. I have drawn up a memorial on the subject addressed to the National Convention, and the French Minister in this city sent it this day to Paris, accompanied with one of his own in my favour, and he gives me the greatest encouragement with respect to it. I therefore hope that I shall not trouble you with any more drafts. * * *

We are anxious to hear the result of Mr. Jay's mission, wishing for peace, but at the same time preparing for war. In the mean time, hostilities seem to be taking place, not only with the Indians, but with the British, in the back country. In about a week we proceed to Northumberland, from which place I shall soon write to you.

LETTER XXXV.

Dr. Priestley to Benjamin Vaughan, Esq., M.P.

Northumberland, July 30, 1794.

Dear Sir,—I thought you would rather choose to hear from (*me*) at this time, than immediately on my arrival in this country, when I could not have given you any information from observations of my own. I have now seen all the principal people, and also persons who may be said to be in the *opposition*. I take no part in the politics of the country, and consort chiefly with your brother and his friends, who are warm friends of *government*, as the phrase would be in England. I perceive, however, that the opposition is very considerable, and I am persuaded does not consist, as your brother will have it, of ill-intentioned men. They are called *Anti-federalists*, and object principally to the *Excise laws* and *funding* system, founded on a national debt, which they wish to have discharged, while others avow a liking of it, as a means of creating a dependence on the governing power, which they think is wanting in this country, though it has grown to a dangerous excess in England. The introduction of paper money is objected to as having been the means of raising the price of everything in the great towns, so as to making living in them more expensive than in London. These

enormous prices have not yet extended far into the country, but they must in time, and the rise having been sudden and continually increasing, is certainly alarming. It will put a stop to all emigration (*immigration*), except of labourers, and make manufacturing hazardous. A riot has already been occasioned by the excise, and I fear more mischief will arise from it. All parties agree in a wish for *peace with England*, but the opposition lays less stress upon it. Much is expected from the negotiation of Mr. Jay, but more from the success of the arms of France, from which alone they expect permanent peace. * * *

One of the worst things in this country, and what I did not expect to find, is, that the poor-laws are the same as in England, and at New York and at Philadelphia they already begin to find the same inconvenience from them. In Philadelphia the poor's-rate amounts to nine thousand pounds. Indeed, in many other things they seem to copy the English too closely, when they ought rather to take warning by the example. * * *

I shall, I think, prefer the climate of this country to that of England, but I am not yet reconciled to the different mode of living. But I never professed to leave England from *choice*, and from what has taken place there since I left it, I cannot but rejoice that I am where I am. I wish more of my friends were with me. Here I see the news only once a week, and the last we had was of the defeat of the Duke of York and the suspension of the Habeas Corpus, the commitment of Mr. ——— (for whom I feel much interested), and the sending Mr. Tooke, &c. to the Tower. These are considered here as despotic measures, and the prelude to some great convulsion, which I dread.

I shall not get any library or apparatus, nor indeed absolutely fix the place of my residence, till next spring.

With every good wish to yourself and all the family, in which we all join, I am, dear Sir, yours sincerely,

J. PRIESTLEY.

LETTER XXXVI.

Mrs. Priestley to William Vaughan, Esq.

Northumberland, Aug. 26, 1794.

My dear Sir,—I wrote a few lines to you from New York, giving an account of our arrival in America. * * *

I like America very well, nor have ever felt a wish to return. The country and people much as I expected to find them, and I am happy and thankful to meet with so sweet a situation and so peaceful a retreat as the place I now write from. Dr. Priestley also likes it, and of his own choice intends to settle here, which is more than I hoped for at the time we came up. We have taken some ground, and are now in treaty to have a frame-house built upon it to live in. There promises very soon to be a good road, with stage coach betwixt here and Philadelphia, which I have no doubt will bring some English friends to settle here. Be that as it may, I am anxious to be settled ourselves. We are not at a time of life to keep rambling about, which still unhinges people more, and we have—at least I can speak for myself—been sufficiently deranged already. At some future period I will send you a plan of our house, with the extent of our premises and the view from it. You can scarcely form an idea of the hurrying, busy life I have had

since we came to this place. We have a good house, the best in the place, but we can only have it till May. We are all together, and this place has been the head quarters of all the English who have been to view and purchase land, so that I often forget I am in America and so distant from my former friends, though the total derangement of my former habits I expected would have made me feel it more. I have been used to think young people the fittest to change their native soil; in this I have altered my opinion, and that it is desirable people should know well how to estimate the advantages and disadvantages of their own country before they try a new one, or, as is natural, they attribute to a new country entirely everything disagreeable, and all the difficulties they meet with, which belong to all the world, and human nature in general, in the same state of civilization.

This country is very delightful; the prospects of wood and water more beautiful than I have ever seen before; the people plain and decent in their manners, composed pretty much of Americans, some Irish; the country round pretty much or nearly occupied by Germans, some from Scotland. Their manners do not strike, as there is a great stiffness among them. However, as far as I have seen, they are all disposed to be friendly; but it is necessary to make advances. And the English in general have this summer gone by the title of gentlefolks, so that it is natural for them all to wish to pluck a feather out of the goose. They are also very jealous of the English, and they may think themselves that we have some advantages; the English will do very well not to put them in mind of it. * * * I do very well, and like them as well as any new acquaintances I ever made before. This, however, is not the case with all that come into this country. A Mr. Nicholls from Manchester, a mathematician, and I believe a very honest, worthy man, unfortunately for himself as well as others, is come into this country. He is helpless to the last degree in all worldly matters, and his temper soured with disappointment. He had written to some friends in England a most unfavourable account indeed of the people of this country, with some personal reflections. The simplicity of the man made him leave this bundle of papers, tied up with a string, with his landlord, until he returned out of the woods. This fellow read them, suffered copies to be taken of them, and has put the whole country in a flame. The misfortune was, that many of the observations are as true as they are severe. The odium is thrown indiscriminately on all the English. No one pretends to vindicate the man's conduct; at the same time it has left an ill impression on people's minds. * * * It is not clear that that scheme * will go on. The land does not appear to be what was expected, and I wish Joseph would settle independently of any others.

MARY PRIESTLEY.

* A scheme for forming a company for the purchase and re-sale of lands in the county of Northumberland (300,000 acres), the intended promoters of which were Joseph Priestley the younger, Mr. Abel Humphries and Mr. John Vaughan. A printed paper recommending the purchase of American lands, signed by J. P., Jun., and offering to be the agent for English purchasers, and a MS. memorandum of the heads of agreement between the promoters of the land scheme and Robert Morris and John Nicholson, of Philadelphia, are included in the volume in the Warrington Library.

LETTER XXXVII.

Mr. William Vaughan to Mr. Wilkinson.

Oct. 25, 1794.

Dear Sir,—Mr. Lindsey is now with me. He has a letter from Dr. Priestley of 14th of September from Northumberland. “What brought us here is the expectation of being near the settlement that my son and Mr. Cooper were projecting, and behold, *that is all over*. When the lands came to be viewed, they appeared not to be worth purchasing or accepting of; so that many will be sorely disappointed. I now advise my son to get a farm for himself near me, and think no more of large partnerships, which seldom answer.” * * * The Professor at the college of Philadelphia for Chemistry is supposed to be on his death-bed. In case of a vacancy, Dr. Rush thinks the Dr. will be invited to succeed. In this case, he must reside four months in the year at Philadelphia. * * *

Oct. 25, 1794.

LETTER XXXVIII.

Dr. Priestley to John Wilkinson, Esq.

Northumberland, Nov. 12, 1794.

Dear Sir,—Joseph will have informed you of the giving up of the scheme of purchasing the 300,000 acres, and of the reason of it. There are, however, who think the scheme would have answered; but nothing could be done without a perfect and hearty concurrence in all the persons concerned. Some purchases that were in the neighbourhood of the intended settlement are likely to answer very well, and several settlers are already upon the lands. As to myself, having come so far and liking the country, I am determined to fix *here*. There are many things concur to recommend this situation to me. The country is very pleasant, the climate better than in Philadelphia or any where near it, living almost as cheap again (indeed, my funds would not have supported me at Philadelphia or New York), and I have more leisure for my pursuits. Besides, as my library and apparatus are now in part arrived, and the remainder expected in a few days, and the expense and risk of the conveyance from Philadelphia greater than can well be imagined, I cannot think of a second remove. As houses are not to be got here, I have begun to build one; but the expense will be great, on account of the enormously high price of labour and the scarcity of workmen of all kinds. * * *

I rejoice that I left England when I did, though I never can expect to enjoy myself as I did there. We have not been without some disturbance even here; but I hope it is now effectually quelled, and without bloodshed. I am much affected by the capture of Mr. Russell by the French; but I hope that, in consequence of the representations that have been made here, he will soon be permitted to pursue his voyage. I was expecting to see him every day. Your sister is pretty well, and in tolerably good spirits, but she is obliged to do everything herself, having at present only a young girl in the house. Good servants are not to be had for any price. All my sons, I hope, will settle on farms in the neighbourhood of this place; but there is not much good land near us, and of course what there is bears a great price. * * *

LETTER XXXIX.

To the Same.

Northumberland, July 24, 1795.

Dear Sir,—I thank you for the account that, by your direction, Mr. Watson has sent me of the dispute between you and your brother, though hardly anything that ever happened to me has given me so much concern. I flattered myself that both you and I should end our days in peace, and, as you have been the means of making me easy and comfortable, I should by one means or other contribute some little to your satisfaction. But this is a business in which I can do nothing. Notwithstanding what I wrote to your brother, I perceive he is determined to proceed to the greatest extremity. It is to be regretted that no common friend could have stepped in and have prevented or moderated this rupture, which in all events must end ill. I had thought that Mr. More might have been the person to do this kind office, but I hear he is breaking and not likely to live long. I once thought that, notwithstanding the multiplicity and magnitude of your concerns, the situation of the country might lead you to wish to end your days in peace with us; and a more agreeable place than this there cannot well be in the world, and for men of great views and objects, no country affords a scope comparable to this. * * * The very sight of a country in a state of such rapid improvement is animating even to the idle and speculative. But here are few persons idle.

I think I told you that my son Harry was farming for himself. For activity and industry and good judgment (as judges say), he has few equals, though he has many difficulties to struggle with, his land being all to clear. He lives in what is called a *log-house*, which has only one room, and a garret, containing hay and straw, above him. He is about, however, to build a stone house with two rooms, but no second story.

We hope to get our college established the next year, and if it yield me any income, I shall be better able to help my sons. Your sister is rather too fully employed in fitting up our temporary house and providing everything for the other. In all this I take no concern; but I am now as busy in my own way, writing and experimenting, as in any period of my life. I shall soon add two more volumes to my *Church History*, and I am about to send to the Philosophical Society at Philadelphia an account of some experiments I have lately made, in pursuance of those I began at Hackney. Considering the distance I am at from the sea, I am better situated for experiments than you would imagine. We have ingenious workmen of almost every kind in this place, so that I hardly want anything but a glass house. Living so far from a seaport, I have found great difficulty in sending what I have printed here to England. One, however, by accident, has got thither, and Mr. Lindsey has reprinted it. It is my answer to *Mr. Paine*, of which he had my directions to give you a copy. I hope you have received it. I am now printing *Observations on the Increase of Infidelity*, and hope to have better success in sending it. * * *

Since I wrote the above, my wife has had a very alarming spitting of blood, the second she has had in this country. Yesterday she was able to walk out of her room.

LETTER XL.

Dr. Priestley to Mr. Watson.

Dear Sir,—I think myself much obliged to you for the pains you have taken to give me so circumstantial an account of the difference between the Mr. Wilkinsons. Though hardly anything gives *(me)* more concern, I cannot help being interested in it, and therefore desirous of knowing the particulars. The last I have received from you, which is the third, gives me some hopes that the affair may be compromised, and, judging by my own feelings, I should think that any termination, at Mr. J. Wilkinson's time of life, must be desirable; and I was in hopes that both he and I, who are nearly of the same age, might be permitted to pass the remainder of a busy life in peace and quiet. I find I am not fit for such exertion as I have used, though I could not bear to be idle. I am the more embarrassed by this affair because I am under considerable obligations to William W. as well as John, though much more to the latter; and I hope I shall never be ungrateful to any man, though I may disapprove of his conduct ever so much.

I am very happy to find that both you and your brother are in connection with Mr. Wilkinson, as I have no doubt it will be to your advantage; and I have been exceedingly affected at the accounts I have had of your father's and your own afflictions. They have indeed been uncommonly great; and it must have required all the fortitude and religion that you are possessed of, to enable you to bear them. It is chiefly in adversity that we feel the value of religious principles; and the firm belief that everything, without exception, is directed by a wise and good Providence, and that all will terminate in the happiest manner, notwithstanding any appearances to the contrary, is sufficient to bear us up under any troubles, at least after the first shock is over. And after great trials, the most unexpected resources sometimes occur. I do not know what I could have done without the seasonable generosity of Mr. Wilkinson, driven as I was from my native country and the means of support I had in it, at a time of life when I am not capable of engaging with effect in anything new, and having my sons to settle at the same time. We are now all set down in the cheapest part of the country, and they are all beginning to farm on a small scale, and with industry, in which they are not deficient, I hope they will do very well. But all that can be got by farming is a subsistence; and the natives, from their very frugal habits, and such a constant attention to small gains as we are hardly capable of, have the advantage of us. The English settlers, however, think they shall find their advantage in their superior knowledge and spirit of enterprize, the ground being cultivated by the Americans in the most slovenly and unprofitable manner. But in this they may flatter themselves too much. The greatest difficulty we have to contend with is the high price of labour, at least double of what it is in England. In consequence of this no farm is cultivated but by the farmer's own labour and that of his sons, and when much work is to be done in a short time, all the neighbours help one another. Some farms are on lease, the tenant giving the proprietor one-half of the produce; but this requires great attention to the cultivation and the crops.

On the whole the people here are independent and happy, far beyond what they are in England, the government being perfectly free and giving no obstruction to industry of any kind. Here is no *tithe*, and no *poor*, and hardly any taxes, and I do not see what we can ask for more in this world, and the climate is beyond measure superior to that of England. The injury of hay or corn by rain is hardly known here, and the clearness of the air is highly favourable to health and good spirits. For though both the heat and the cold are greater than in England, they are more tolerable, and extreme heat is soon relieved by a thunder-storm and rain. The only unpleasant thing is the breaking up of the snow and ice in the spring.

I am, dear Sir, yours sincerely,
Northumberland, Aug. 7, 1795.

J. PRIESTLEY.

LETTER XLI.

Dr. Priestley to John Wilkinson, Esq.

Northumberland, Dec. 17, 1795.

Dear Sir,—You will sympathize with us when I tell you that we have just buried our son Henry. The loss is the more severely felt, as it was unexpected till the very day of his death. He had had an ague, which was very generally prevalent in this country the last summer, but had recovered very well, and even a second time after a relapse. But after this, he had frequent colds and indisposition, which affected his stomach and bowels. On Friday, the 5th of this month, he came from his farm wet and cold, but we did not apprehend anything from it; but on Monday he was more seriously ill and vomited constantly, which is one symptom of an inflammation in the stomach, which, however, the physician did not suppose to be his case. From Tuesday he was generally delirious, and he died on the Friday evening, as is not doubted now, of the inflammation and mortification.

He was indefatigable in the attention he gave to his farm, and had just built a little stone house, which was nearly ready to be occupied. He is thought by some to have suffered most by watching at a lime-kiln, though I do not find that he ever sat up all night to attend it. Considering how delicate his constitution was, and that his education was for a learned profession, it was something extraordinary that he should so cheerfully submit to all the drudgery of a common farmer. It was the wonder of everybody. Had he been brought up an American farmer, he could not have been more industrious. Indeed, the Americans are not remarkably industrious. They can do very well without hard labour, and therefore will not in general submit to it. The English emigrants, it is observed, work much harder than they.

This being the first stroke of the kind, it affects me more than I can express, though I hope I do not complain of the dispensations of Providence, which, I doubt not, are always right and wise; but my chief consolation is the expectation of meeting him again in a better state.

Your sister has had several very alarming spittings of blood, and has now a very violent cough, occasioned by sitting up three nights with Harry. Her trials have been in several respects very great. For three months, a great part of which time she was confined to her room or her bed, she had no maid-servant, and now we only hire a black slave by the week. The country is in too prosperous a state for servitude, and

it is observed that the difficulty of getting servants increases continually. All that can be had are young boys or girls. While your sister is well, she does not complain, as she very cheerfully does everything herself; but when she is ill, which is often the case, it is hard with her.

I hope that by this time your affair with your brother is settled some way or other. It has given me much concern, and, judging by myself, I think you will be better satisfied with an unjust decision than no decision at all. My wife joins me in every good wish to yourself and Mrs. Wilkinson. Yours sincerely,

J. PRIESTLEY.

THE SOCIAL CONDITION AND PROSPECTS OF THE PEOPLE.*

THE two works of which we give the titles below, present a curious contrast to each other; and the more so as, from their simultaneous publication, there is no reference in either to the contents of the other, no appearance or probability of intentional opposition. Each writer offers an independent testimony, though the two may be said to represent two widely different and well-known schools in social science. Mr. Kay belongs to what may be called the Centralization school, maintaining the proposition, "that the moral, intellectual and physical condition of *any* people, no matter what their race, is almost entirely the result of the laws and institutions under which they live; and that this condition is capable of indefinite improvement, by an improvement of those laws and institutions."† Mr. Laing, on the other hand, maintains that "the circumstances under which a people live, form the mind, character and institutions of that people." Laws and institutions that look perfect in theory and on paper, are not necessarily those best suited or most applicable to a particular people; and every improvement, to be real and effectual, must either spring from the people, or at least be wisely adapted to their peculiar character and habits, so as to be virtually in great measure the creation of the people themselves. Mr. Kay's proposition is an over-statement, or rather a one-sided view. Laws and institutions, to be abiding and efficient, must be in some measure the natural growth or result of the circumstances and character of a people, though they, doubtless, exercise a very important reciprocal influence on the condition and progress of the people themselves. The two authors before us have looked at different sides of the shield. The impression left by the perusal of Mr. Kay's book is, that in England everything tends to promote the wealth, luxury and refinement of the few, but that in regard to the happiness, comfort, intelligence, manners and morals of the great mass of the population, England is

* The Social Condition and Education of the People in England and Europe; shewing the Results of the Primary Schools, and of the Division of Landed Property, in Foreign Countries. By Joseph Kay, Esq., M.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge; Barrister-at-law; and late Travelling Bachelor of the University of Cambridge. 2 vols. London—Longman, &c. 1850.

Observations on the Social and Political State of the European People in 1848 and 1849; being the Second Series of the Notes of a Traveller. By Samuel Laing, Esq., &c. London—Longman, &c. 1850.

† Kay, Vol. I. p. 8.

far inferior to every other European country (except Russia, Turkey, Southern Italy, Spain and Portugal), and that while Prussia, Germany, France, &c., are rapidly improving, England is daily growing worse. It gives a rude shock to the national pride of an Englishman to be told so plainly by the Travelling Bachelor of the University of Cambridge, that the state of his country is a thing to be ashamed of rather than to glory in, and that, in regard to the most important matters, England, "the envy of surrounding nations and the admiration of the world," is falling further and further into the rear. Mr. Laing's book, however, is an excellent restorative. His shrewd, observing eye has examined the very same ground, and he is most comfortably sceptical as to any real inferiority in England and as to any bright prospects for the Continent of Europe, which, on the contrary, he thinks is rapidly approaching a fearful crisis.

But we would approach our subject in a nobler spirit than that of national rivalry, and with a wider view than that of discussing questions of relative superiority. Without blinding ourselves to actual deficiencies and evils in our country, we would endeavour to discern in what directions there is the most need and the greatest capability of improvement, and be thankful if we can derive any lessons for our guidance from the experience of other countries.

Mr. Kay's work is mainly occupied with the development and illustration of two positions,—that an immense improvement in the condition of the people abroad has taken place within the last thirty-five years, 1st, from the system of universal education, and, 2nd, from the division of the land into small properties. To these causes he assigns the peaceable conduct of the German peasants in the late revolutionary period. He also speaks highly of the effects of the universal military education in giving the people habits of neatness and order, increasing their knowledge of the world, strengthening their patriotic sentiments, rendering them vigorous and hardy, and imparting manly courtesy to their manners and bearing. He gives a high moral character to the military service of Germany as compared with that of England, and alleges that the three years spent in the army are a useful check upon early and improvident marriages, and that, by infusing greater refinement of taste into the young men, this military education tends to raise the condition of the female peasants. Mr. Kay, however, guards himself from being supposed to imply that the universal military education of Germany might be advantageously introduced into England. It is easy to conceive, indeed, that it might have some advantages. The manners and deportment of a well-drilled soldier would be a welcome exchange for the rude, uncouth, awkward loutishness of many of the labouring classes in England. We have often longed that some of our rough Lancashire boors could have the benefit of a few months' drill. But this remedy would perhaps be worse than the disease. Mr. Laing emphatically contradicts Mr. Kay with respect to the Prussian Landwehr service, maintaining that its evils are very great, by keeping a youth for three years from entering on a productive employment, unsettling him for peaceful industry and exposing him to moral contagion; and that the universal obligation to spend a portion of every year in military service is felt to be an intolerable inconvenience and grievance, to which even the French conscription was light. Mr. Laing is strongly of opinion

that the Prussian system, however wisely devised for throwing off the domination of the French in a moment of national enthusiasm, is much worse policy, as a constant institution, both in a military and in a social point of view, than the keeping up of a regular standing army. And certainly, if there must be soldiers, it seems better that they should consist of those who have a taste for fighting, or who are fit for nothing else, than that every man should be compelled to devote a regular portion of his time, however valuable to himself and to others, and in utter disregard of his physical powers, tastes and qualifications, to the irksome and mechanical exercises requisite for learning the art of war. It might be a recommendation of such a system, in the eyes of our Peace Societies, that, by calling upon every man to contribute by his own personal training to "our national defences," it would be felt to be such an intolerable grievance, that the nation would soon determine not to "learn war any more." But if we cannot yet agree to dispense altogether with fighting-men, it is surely the wisest economy to extend to our armies and navies the great principle of the division of labour, and to recruit their ranks from the idle scapegraces abounding everywhere, who seem least capable of steady, useful industry. Those who abuse their freedom may most fitly be consigned to the slavery of military service. Mr. Laing observes that in England, where the representatives of the people hold the purse-strings, we are two centuries past the danger of a standing army being employed to crush our liberty and rights; and clearly proves, we think, that to exchange the system of standing armies for a system of universal drilling, so far from being a step in advance, would be going back towards barbarism.

But we will now proceed to consider the subjects with which Mr. Kay's volumes are mainly occupied—the effects on the Continent of the division of land into small properties, and of the universal education of the people. According to him, all is *couleur de rose*. The people are industrious, thrifty, prudent, intelligent, prosperous, well-housed, well-fed, well-clad, well-mannered and respectable. He begins by pointing out the evils consequent, in England, on the cumbrous and costly technicalities of the law in relation to land, which have the effect, he alleges, of accumulating it in large properties, lessening the number of small farms, producing an idle and spendthrift class, burdening estates with debt, defrauding creditors, retarding the progress of agriculture, with various other bad consequences which he makes out very clearly, but which we cannot stay to particularize.* The most important point in relation to the matter seems to us to be the vast stimulus which the *possession* of land gives to the industry of the peasant proprietor. The simplicity of the laws affecting landed property in most foreign countries gives great facilities for the acquisition of land. There is no law of primo-

* One of Mr. Kay's reasons (Vol. I. p. 217) why the cultivators must be better off where they are proprietors than where they are tenants under a great proprietor, is, that, in the former case, the *whole* produce of the land is their own, whilst, in the latter case, a large portion goes in the shape of rent, to increase the luxury of the landlord. This is as much as to say that, if a landlord were to make a present of his land to his tenants, it would greatly improve their condition. But the cultivators can become proprietors only by *purchasing* their farms, and the loss of the interest of the purchase-money would be equivalent to the payment of rent.

geniture and entail. Every proprietor of land may sell or dispose of it as he pleases during his life-time, and leave it to whom he pleases at his death, but there his power over it ends. In France, Switzerland and the Rhine provinces, the proprietor cannot even do this, the law enforcing the equal division of the land or of its value among his children. The obvious objection which this law suggests is, that the land must soon be subdivided into portions so small as to be practically worthless. This result, however, according to Mr. Kay and the authorities cited by him, does not practically ensue. The properties do not decrease below a certain size, but when it is inexpedient to divide them, they are either sold and the proceeds divided among the heirs, or one of the heirs purchases the shares of the rest. Still, it seems to be the simplest and best plan to leave every proprietor at liberty to bequeath his land to whomsoever he will, but to make his power over it there terminate. The facilities afforded abroad for the purchase of land inspire in every young man a strong motive to be industrious, prudent and self-denying, that he may become the purchaser of a garden or a farm; and when he has obtained it, he toils early and late, gives his whole mind and heart to the cultivation of his property, from the feeling that it is *his own*, a savings' bank, as it were, in which every effort, every outlay, may be safely and profitably invested. Mr. Kay contrasts the condition of the continental countries before the old feudal laws were repealed by the first French Revolution, with their present condition, now that the mass of the peasants have been enabled to become proprietors of land, and draws two very striking and very different pictures. One important effect which he ascribes to the division of land, is the check upon improvident marriages consequent on the industrious and thrifty habits and higher standard of living which it has produced. He quotes largely from writers of reputation on this point, and, among others, from Mr. Mill and Mr. Laing, who states, in his Residence in Norway, that "the rate of increase of the French population is the slowest in Europe." Great poverty and pauperism are almost unknown, virtuous and temperate habits are formed, property is respected, and the cultivation of the land is greatly improved. Mr. Kay carefully contrasts the position of the Irish *tenants*, who have no interest in exerting themselves, (more than they can possibly produce being due in the shape of an exorbitant rent, and their tenure being wholly uncertain,) with *proprietors*, who have no such liabilities and fears. He quotes authorities in proof of the position that both the gross and the net products of a given extent of land, cultivated by peasant proprietors, are greater than those of the same extent, held by a few great proprietors and cultivated by tenant farmers. This is owing, principally, to the extraordinary interest felt by every member of the peasant's family in making the most of the land in every way, and to the care with which every strip and corner is turned to the greatest advantage. The consciousness of ownership seems to create a garden out of the poorest soil, which would otherwise lie waste. In the striking language of Arthur Young, describing the cultivated sands near Dunkirk, and quoted by Mr. Mill, "the magic of property turns sand to gold." "Give a man the secure possession of a bleak rock, and he will turn it into a garden; give him a nine years' lease of a garden, and he will convert it into a desert." On this point, Mr. Kay contrasts Switzerland with the mountain districts of Wales,

Westmoreland, Ireland and Scotland. The system of education here lends its aid, the teachers being instructed at the Normal Colleges in the science of agriculture and the art of gardening. Mr. Kay proceeds to contrast the comfortable dwellings, dress and mode of living, and the refined amusements of the peasants abroad, with the squalid appearance and degraded condition of our own poor, and affirms that no such class as those who infest the lowest haunts of our towns are to be seen on the Continent. The possession of land also renders the population conservative, averse to rash political changes (which, Mr. Kay avers, has been confirmed by the events of late years), and causes a greater diffusion of the comforts and blessings of life. But our space will not permit us even to hint at all the happy effects which our author ascribes to the division of land amongst an educated peasantry. Our readers have only to conceive for themselves everything that they would wish to see realized in a prosperous, enlightened and virtuous community, and we must refer them to Mr. Kay's pages for accumulated evidence and authority on every point.

And now, what says Mr. Laing as to the *bad* effects of this subdivision of land, after admitting, in the main, the advantages alleged by Mr. Kay? His first objection is, that it produces a stationary condition, not a progressive community—a multitude of isolated families, each “living a kind of Robinson Crusoe life on its own patch of land, producing in a rough way all it wants, and going without what it cannot produce,” rather than a society of mutually dependent and mutually enriching producers. There is no class to create a demand for the gratifications and refinements of a higher state of civilization.

“In the countries or districts in which this social state has been established for ages, as in Switzerland, the Tyrol, Norway, Flanders, the man of the 19th century is the man of the 14th. His way of living, his way of thinking, his diet, dwelling, dress, his tastes, wants and enjoyments, his ideas, his civilization, are stereotyped. Co-operative industry, science, invention, judgment, applied to the ornamental or useful arts, commerce, manufactures, the tastes for and enjoyments of civilized life, are dormant, to a great degree, in a social state which affords no markets, no consumption, no demand for the productions of the ingenuity, skill and enterprise of other people.” * * * “This may be a very happy social state, and altogether in accordance with the spirit and precepts of ancient philosophers; but it is a philosophy of barbarism, not of civilization; a social state of routine and stagnation, not of activity and progress.” * * * “Where manufactures have been established, as in Switzerland, Belgium and on the Rhine, it is upon the foreign market, not upon any consumption at home, that they depend. In the social state of Britain it is the reverse. Our export trade, immense as it is, appears but a trifle compared to our home consumption, in our own families, of all that labour, skill, ingenuity and capital produce for the gratification of the tastes and wants of civilized life among our own population. The interchange of industry for industry among the individual producers in our social state, is a perpetual animating principle, like the circulation of the blood in the human frame.”*

Mr. Laing, therefore, admitting all that Mr. Kay says as to the striking improvement in the condition of the continental people consequent on the subdivision of land, would have us believe that this improvement can advance only to a state of moderate, universal comfort, and there stop. Supposing him to be right, however; if the alternative really be

* Laing, pp. 94, 95.

such a state as Mr. Kay describes, or a state in which a few enjoy unbounded wealth, luxury and refinement, while the many are sunk in degradation and struggle for a miserable maintenance,—if it be really impossible to combine the advantages of both states,—we think that every Christian well-wisher to his race is bound, in duty to God and man, to prefer the former to the latter. It is surely more important that the people at large should develop their faculties to a certain extent, than that a few favoured children of wealth should cultivate refined tastes at the expense of wretched millions.* We feel disposed, moreover, to doubt the necessary correctness of Mr. Laing's opinion, especially as, in a previous passage of his work,† he adopts the same reasoning in strongly discouraging a poor labouring man from emigrating to colonies in search of work, on the ground that newly-settled emigrants do all their own work themselves, and there is no demand for hired labour. But it is surely a notorious fact that, in most newly-colonized districts, labour is in great demand and the rate of wages high. Again, in a subsequent chapter,‡ where he strikingly contrasts the French taste for display in mere elegance and ornament, with the English demand for every conceivable article of utility, neatness and comfort in the highest possible finish, he dwells upon the vast advantage of the latter, in giving employment to numberless artificers, whom the former would displace for a comparatively small number employed in the costly works of the fine arts. Now it seems to us that the existence of this latter demand, which Mr. Laing justly deems so important, is naturally more compatible with a community of thriving, industrious families in moderate circumstances, such as Mr. Kay and Mr. Laing agree in representing the peasant proprietors, than with a nation in which the few are rich and the many miserably poor.

But Mr. Laing makes a second and more fatal objection to the subdivision of land in France, arising from the accumulating burden of *debt* occasioned by the necessity of one heir purchasing the shares of the co-heirs, which he is often compelled to do by paying an annuity or fixed charge upon the yearly produce. The amount of registered mortgages in France from this cause Mr. Laing states, on authority, to have been 450 millions of pounds sterling in 1832, 500 millions in 1840, and not less than 560 millions in 1849.

"These mortgages represent the value of the portions of land belonging to the co-heirs of the actual occupants of the original farms." * * * "It is estimated . . . that, after paying the interest of his debt and the government taxes and rates, the peasant proprietor in France has not, on an average, above three-eighths of the yearly produce of his estate left for his own subsistence. On his death the burden on the estate is increased by an additional set of co-heirs. This is a retrograde, not an advancing, condition of the agricultural population, which is the great mass of the social body." * * * "The ostensible owner is more and more burdened with debt in each generation, can afford to buy less, and not more, of the comforts and conveniences of life; and consequently the home market for the products of the useful arts, and the taste and habit of enjoying them, are diminishing along with the means

* Besides, according to Reichensperger's description of the Rhine Provinces before the subdivision of the land (Kay, Vol. I. p. 132), the condition of the peasantry was then *stationary*, and at the same time *miserable*. Stationary comfort is at least better than stationary wretchedness.

† P. 63.

‡ P. 120.

of the great mass of the population to indulge in them. The effect of this social state is prejudicial, not only to consumers, but to producers. The workman in any trade, or handicraft, who has something, however small it may be, paid regularly out of his inheritance, will scarcely work so steadily as the man who depends upon his trade alone, and his skill and expertness as a producer."*

Mr. Laing adds, that the scarcity of employment thus created among the various classes of workmen by the diminished demand for their labour, congregates a mass of half-employed, turbulent operatives in every city. This second objection, it is obvious to remark, directly contradicts the first, since it affirms that the condition of society produced is *not* stationary, but rather retrogressive. It must be observed, moreover, that, on Mr. Laing's own showing, this objection applies only to a country like France, in which the law compels the value of the land to be divided among all the members of each successive generation. In such circumstances, we confess, the objection seems a strong one, and the ultimate tendency of the law disastrous.

Mr. Laing advances a third objection, in the alleged political want of an intermediate element between the governing and the governed, exercising a moral influence over both, such as is afforded by a class possessing considerable property and high standing in the country. In a subsequent chapter,† he draws a formidable picture of the evils of *functionarism* in Germany, and maintains that the immense body of government functionaries, whose minutely ramifying agency penetrates every department of social life, is a bad exchange for a true aristocracy. We do not see, however, that this evil, allowing it to exist in Germany and Prussia, is a necessary consequence of the distribution of landed property. Mr. Laing himself admits that it has been avoided in Norway and the United States, and where government is controlled by a representative body, chosen by the people, there must be the best possible check upon the evils of functionarism or of any other form of excessive interference. Nor let it be forgotten that a landed aristocracy is at least as capable of becoming a source of oppression as a barrier of protection. At all events, in aristocratic, wealthy, manufacturing and commercial England, any possible danger to be apprehended from the absence of an influential body is distant indeed, if not wholly visionary.

Mr. Laing objects, fourthly, in the teeth of Mr. Cobden and others, that the distribution of landed property tends to create an increasing class who are clamorous for war, owing to the accumulating numbers of young men in the various families, beyond what are wanted for the cultivation of the soil, who have, therefore, no employment until the estate becomes vacant by the death of their parents. Ably as Mr. Laing argues the point, we confess we do not see why this tendency should be a peculiar or necessary consequence of the system from which he would deduce it. He has himself previously admitted that the diffusion of small landed properties makes men prudent, saving and conservative, and, by checking improvident marriages, restrains the excessive growth of the population, so that the rate of increase in France (to which country his remarks on the warlike spirit especially apply) is the slowest in Europe. Why, then, there should be a larger pro-

* Pp. 98—100.

† Chap. ix. p. 173.

portion of the people clamorous for war than in countries (such as England and, still more, Ireland) where the mass of the people are more reckless and improvident, and where the more rapid rate of increase presses more urgently on the means of employment and subsistence, we are unable to comprehend; and if Mr. Laing be right as to the fact, we think it must be owing to other causes than that to which he has assigned it. We cannot help thinking that an educated, intelligent, respectable class, who have been brought up in decent and sober habits, must naturally be less ferocious and reckless, less eager to expose themselves to the mad excitement and deadly perils of war, than the barbarous and brutal hordes infesting a country in which wealth and pauperism, the highest refinement and the grossest ignorance, equally abound.

The conclusion to which we have come, after the best consideration we could give to the matter, is, that the distribution of land in small properties, though not in itself a panacea for all social evils, is an important element, in connection with other agencies, in a sound and healthy social condition; and that it is desirable that every legal facility should be given for the cheap and secure transfer of land by purchase, like any other commodity. The possibility of becoming the owner of a farm or garden, on which he might safely and profitably expend all his energies, would afford a hopeful stimulus to the labourer to be diligent and saving, which is now too often wanting; and millions of acres might be made the means of supporting an industrious and contented population, which now lie waste and unproductive, while swarms of wretched outcasts pick up a precarious living in the filthiest and meanest occupations, if not in vice and crime, or subsist as idle and listless paupers at the expense of burdened and grudging rate-payers.*

But our limits warn us that it is time to turn to the other feature of the social condition on the Continent eulogized by Mr. Kay—the system of universal education. We must leave to the imagination of our readers, unless they will peruse for themselves, the elaborate and fearful picture presented in the second half of the first volume, of the condition of the poor in England—the amount of pauperism and of crime—the want of more clergy and of a different sort (after the example of the Romish Church), more closely approaching the people themselves—the increase in the number of vagrants—their lodging-houses—burial-clubs and infanticide—the dwellings of the poor—the want of mental and religious training—the Game Laws—gin-palaces—prisons, &c. His statements are very horrible, but they are almost entirely compiled from other publications, some of which have been noticed in this periodical;† and we have no doubt that our readers are, for the most part, but too familiar with them. The second volume is devoted entirely to the subject of Education, and is principally occupied with descriptions, taken from various sources, including the author's personal observation, of the nature and working of the systems of education pursued in different continental

* We would here express our approval of the principle advocated by the Poor-law Association, of making pauperism, as far as practicable, self-supporting, by employing able-bodied paupers in remunerative labour on waste lands or in the acquirement of a trade.

† Worsley on Juvenile Depravity, Clay's Report of the Preston House of Correction, Mr. Rushton, &c.

countries. In his introductory remarks he contrasts the swarms of ragged, filthy children to be seen idling, fighting or corrupting one another in the streets of an English town, with the cleanly, orderly, decent appearance of the German children, all of whom are regularly sent to school. He affirms that the same religious differences were in the way on the Continent which form an obstacle in England, but that they have been overruled—"the great principle has finally triumphed." In his first volume, however, when assigning the causes of the recent revolutions abroad, he affirmed that there was a total absence of political liberty. "In the beginning of 1848, there was not even the semblance of political liberty. There was neither liberty of speech, nor liberty of action, nor freedom of the press. The people were treated like children. The governments did everything for them, and suffered them to take no part worth speaking of in the direction of national affairs."* This he illustrates from his own personal observation. Now, if there was no political liberty, it may safely be inferred that there was no religious liberty, for the two always stand or fall together; and we have always understood that, though the Prussian government tolerated Catholics and Protestants, there was not much, if any, scope for the profession of the various shades of religious belief which are free to develop themselves in our own country. Every man was required to conform himself to one of two or three prescribed patterns. When, therefore, Mr. Kay says that religious differences and objections were *overruled* in the establishment of the Prussian educational system, he must mean that the authority of government put them down or forbade their manifestation, so that the triumph of the principle in Prussia forms no valid precedent for its practicability in England. There is much truth and force, however, in the following passages:

"Between the years 1835 and 1846, the country [England] expended £57,254,541, besides the immense outlay of private charity, in the temporary relief of pauperism, and we are now throwing into the same gradually widening lagune more than £5,000,000 per annum, whilst we do not expend on the improvement of the notoriously deficient materials for the education of our poor more than £200,000 per annum! In Prussia, the tables are strangely turned. She has within the last twenty-five years spent many *millions* on the perfection of her schools, and of the materials necessary for the education of her people; while the funds necessary for the relief of pauperism have continued so small, as not to require any additional forced tax like our poor rates." * * * "But there are some who say, that if our means of direct education are worse, yet that our means of indirect education are better, than those of other countries. * * * As far as regards the middle classes, this is all very true; but, as regards the poor, it is ridiculously false. Most of our poor are either wholly without education, or else possess so little as to be entirely out of the sphere of such influences as those I have enumerated. What good can one of our boorish peasants gain from cheap literature, free parliamentary debates, free discussion, and liberal journals? What advantage is it to a starving man that there is bread in the baker's shop, if he has not wherewith to buy? What good is cheap literature and free discussion to a poor peasant who can neither read nor think? He starves in the midst of plenty, and starves too with a curse upon his lips."†

Mr. Kay stoutly maintains, in declared opposition to Mr. Laing (alluding to the First Series of his Notes of a Traveller), that the

* Kay, Vol. I. p. 17.

† Kay, Vol. II. pp. 10—12.

common prejudice against the German educational system, as forced upon the people and managed for them by the State, is wholly unfounded. He denies that there is any excessive centralization or undue external control in the matter.

"It is the parishes and towns which tax themselves for educational purposes; it is the parishioners and citizens who elect their own teachers, pay them, and provide all the materials for the education of their own poor—who determine whether they will have separate schools for their different religious sects, or common schools for them all—who choose the sites of their school-houses, and the outlay they will make on their erection; and although they have not the power of dismissing a teacher after they have once elected him, without first shewing to government a sufficient ground for such a step, yet they are afforded every facility of forwarding any complaints they may have to make of any teacher they have elected, to the educational authorities appointed to judge such matters, and to protect the teachers from the effects of mere personal animosities or ignorance." *

Mr. Kay lays great stress upon the fact that the government requires simply that there shall be school-accommodation, leaving it entirely to the decision of each parochial committee whether there shall be one mixed school for both religious parties, or a separate school for each. He quotes the following statement, made to him by one of the leading Roman Catholic Counsellors of the Educational Bureau in Berlin :

"We always encourage separate schools when possible, as we think religious instruction can be promoted better in separate than in mixed schools; but, of course, we all think it better to have mixed schools, than to have no schools at all; and when we cannot have separate schools, we are rejoiced to see the religious sects uniting in the support of a mixed one. When mixed schools are decided on by the parochial committees, the teacher is elected by the most numerous of the two sects; or, if two teachers are required, one is elected by one sect, and the other by the other; and in this case each conducts the religious education of the children of his own sect. But when only one teacher is elected, the children of those parents who differ from him in religious belief, are permitted to be taken from the school during the religious lessons, on condition that their parents make arrangements for their religious instruction by their own ministers." †

Mr. Kay illustrates, from his own personal observation, the excellence even of the most inferior schools in Germany, and the content and satisfaction with which they are regarded by the people, and proceeds, in the ensuing chapters, to describe in detail the educational systems of Prussia, Saxony, Bavaria and other German states, Austria, Switzerland, France, Holland, Denmark, Sweden and Norway, quoting largely from other writers and travellers; altogether furnishing a great mass of valuable and instructive matter, presenting many delightful pictures, and drawing sad comparisons with the educational deficiencies of England. One of the most pleasing descriptions is that of a visit paid by the author to Vehrli's Training College in Switzerland, to which he appends the interesting Report upon the same institution, published some years ago by the author's brother, Dr. Kay (now Sir J. P. Kay Shuttleworth), and Mr. Tufnell. After giving the statistics of the educational provision in Prussia and other countries, he makes the startling calculation, that to place England and Wales on anything approaching an equal condition, we require at least 23,531 schools,

* Kay, Vol. II. p. 19.

† Ibid., p. 27.

26,500 teachers, and 41 normal colleges.* He devotes the concluding chapter to a detailed examination of the state of education in England and Wales, and to the suggestion of the steps which he thinks ought to be taken to amend it. After dwelling on the special importance of education in a Protestant country, to enable men to appreciate and be impressed by an intellectual faith, and pointing out the utter inadequacy of the plan pursued by the Committee of Privy Council and the educational societies, as well as of the means at their disposal, he lays down a plan of parochial schools, very much based upon the Prussian system, the government obliging each parish to provide itself with sufficient schools, so far as it is able, and assisting it so far as it is not, and the parish committees having power to compel the attendance of children. He insists also on the importance of normal schools, and of an efficient body of government inspectors, as a necessary security for the competency of the teachers. A peculiar feature in Mr. Kay's plan is the proposal gradually to withdraw the greater portion of the amount now expended in parochial relief, and apply it to the maintenance of the various schools, which, he conceives, would soon render in some measure unnecessary the demoralizing and extending system of outdoor relief. But we must again refer our readers for details to the work itself, which is a most valuable collection of information and suggestions on subjects of vast social importance. If there be a fault in the book, it is that it is composed too much under the influence of one idea and in advocacy of a certain system. We are reminded that the author is brother to the late eminent Secretary to the Educational Committee, and a barrister by profession; and we cannot help suspecting a little special-pleading in behalf of centralization. The case seems too complete—too perfect to be the whole truth. The pictures he presents are too full of light: we cannot help imagining that in nature there must be some qualifying shades—some misery and degradation, for example, in continental cities, if not in the rural districts abroad. He is apt to elaborate one point so as to become apparently inconsistent with himself on others.†

Mr. Laing, on the contrary, does not profess to advocate any particular system, or even to regard his own work as a consistent whole. He contributes the Notes that occurred to him in his travels, not as a systematic treatise, but as so many raw materials, from which his readers are left to draw their own conclusions. These Notes, however, are not simply observations, but include what he has reasoned out in his own mind from what he has observed. Though his volume con-

* Kay, Vol. II. p. 232.

† It would not be fair to hold Mr. Kay accountable for errors committed by the Correspondent of the Morning Chronicle, from whom he largely quotes. But it may be worth observing, as an instance of the rashness with which observers sometimes hasten to a conclusion when they have a case to make out, that the above writer, speaking of the foul, unwholesome air exhaling even from rustic dwellings, states that the most sickening and offensive odours that he ever came in contact with, had nestled themselves on the summit of Beacon Hill, near Bath. (Kay, Vol. I. p. 500.) Any one who knows the place would pronounce this to be perfectly incredible, from such a cause. Now we happen to know, on the authority of a friend, that on that very spot there is (or was, some years ago) an insufferable odour from the profusion of *wild garlic* growing there.

sists, in fact, of scraps, each scrap is carefully finished, and he seems to us to betray an eccentric and prejudiced cast of mind, however shrewd, able and sagacious. Though an independent, he is by no means an unbiassed writer. We fancy he takes pleasure in perplexing the judgment of his readers by alternately blowing hot and cold, and in dissenting from a prevalent impression. Mr. Kay is an able advocate; Mr. Laing an original, acute, profound, sarcastic and entertaining writer. He is not, however, to be implicitly trusted, and constantly fills one with misgivings as to the soundness of his views, plausible and ingenious as they are. Many would demur to his remark* that J. P. Richter and Goethe (in his earlier writings) drew their inspiration from Tristram Shandy. We do not feel convinced by his argument against the abolition of capital punishment (whilst admitting all its alleged evils), on the simple ground that to "abolish the expiatory element in punishment" would be to "abolish the very basis on which Christianity is founded"!† It seems to us that, according to Mr. Laing's theology, the exact parallel would be to put to death, *instead* of the murderer, the most innocent and holy *substitute* that could be found. Moreover, what warrant does Christianity afford for men to take the expiation of guilt into their own hands? Man cannot truly judge his brother. "To his own Master he standeth or falleth." "Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord." Nor do we agree with Mr. Laing in his preference of indirect to direct taxation for the labouring man.‡ The former falls upon him with peculiar weight; and with respect to the plea that it gives him the option, to some extent, of paying it or not by using or abstaining from taxed articles, we think that no man is entitled to evade paying, in fair proportion to his means, for the protection he enjoys. Did space permit, we could specify many points on which his views seem to us fanciful, questionable or inconsistent, and we observed one instance of glaring carelessness. In exposing an extravagant estimate of the amount of prostitution in London, after computing the probable number of unmarried females *between the ages of 16 and 45*, he includes among the necessary deductions to be made from these, the *aged* and the *infants*.§ We have noticed his objections to the system of peasant proprietorship; but near the end of the volume he strongly advocates the identical principle in reference to pauper colonies, after describing the effect of it in fertilizing the poor land on the shores of Holstein. The whole passage is distinctly confirmatory of Mr. Kay's views on the subject, and the following remark strikingly so:

"— the well-being of a nation does not so much consist in the accumulation of great wealth in the hands of a few, or even of a very numerous body of capitalists in a country, as in the right distribution of a much less amount of capital and property among the people at large. * * * The latter is true national wealth in the sense of great material well-being, a good moral and intellectual condition, and a general exemption from want being diffused through and enjoyed by all the community."||

We are unable further to notice any other of the many topics touched upon in his very interesting and amusing volume, but it remains for us briefly to consider what he says in reference to the educational systems abroad. Most of his remarks on this head apply to such questions as

* Laing, p. 6. † Ib., p. 263. ‡ Ib., p. 303. § Ib., p. 277. || Ib., p. 496.

the comparative amount of *university* education in Scotland and in Prussia,—the comparative number of readers, as estimated by the number of booksellers' shops and printing establishments, in Berlin and in a large British city,—and the comparative practical value of the college education given in Germany, Scotland and England. He objects to the German universities that the education given in them deals chiefly in cloudy speculations and abstract propositions, of no value in practical affairs and inapplicable to existing interests,—that the great mass of the students thus educated have nothing to look forward to but employment as government functionaries or university professors,—and that a systematic sameness of influence is thus generated, which Mr. Laing calls a lay Jesuitism, very unfavourable to civil liberty or independent energy, yet dangerous to the peace of the state. To this he ascribes the war with Denmark, which he strongly condemns.* But, supposing him to be right in all this, our present concern is with the effects of the system of universal schooling. These, he affirms, have not proved satisfactory. He admits that knowledge has been diffused, gross ignorance dispelled, cultivated tastes made familiar to the labouring classes, which are unknown with us to many in middle and even in high life, but that there is wanting the practical development of the mental powers and moral sense in “the school of life in a free society, in which every man may manage his own interests according to his own judgment.”†

If this is all that Mr. Laing has to allege in deprecation, it is, we must say, a very far-fetched and irrelevant objection as a set-off against the enormous evils attendant on the want of education in England. It may be worth taking into consideration in a general comparison of the social advantages of England and Germany, but it seems to us to have little force against the system of education in itself, and none whatever against its adoption in England, where we have, in abundance, all the influences of individual freedom, independence and busy, hopeful industry, to preclude the deficiency which Mr. Laing laments in Germany; whilst we suffer, to a frightful extent, from those peculiar evils for which education is the only remedy. Mr. Laing himself twice quotes with approbation the remark of Macchiavelli, that it is equally difficult to make a servile people truly free, and to reduce a free people to slavery. We do not see what danger can reasonably be apprehended from a school education for the English people, to be for a moment compared with the undoubted evils arising from the want of such education. The diffusion of sound knowledge seems to us a matter of much more importance than the distribution of land. A man may become industrious, prudent and saving, without the possession of land, in a country like England, where there is so large a demand for skilled labour of every kind. A good school education, accompanied with industrial training, would vastly diminish the amount of pauperism, by converting the present excessive proportion of ignorant, unskilled labourers into useful producers, supplying one another's wants and creating a demand for one another's labour. For, as Mr. J. S. Mill has well pointed out, every producer of an useful commodity naturally tends to create thereby a corresponding demand for other commodities, the proceeds of other men's labour. If the population be favourably distributed among the

* Laing, p. 227.

† Ibid., p. 531.

various classes of producers, an increased supply is equivalent to an increased demand.

Notwithstanding the gloomy pictures of our present social condition given by Mr. Kay and others, we are far from despairing of our country. In many things she has made vast and wonderful progress during the present century, and we doubt not that before its close she will exhibit an equally striking advance in matters of still greater social importance. Though not free from serious disease, she has soundness and vigour in her constitution, which will speedily throw it off if the proper remedies be applied, and however impatient we may be to resort to them, we can have no desponding doubts as to the ultimate issue. There is, after all, much to be thankful for in our social institutions and in our national character and position, and we cannot help feeling some sympathy with Mr. Laing's sturdy British prejudice in his sarcastic comments on the tawdry splendour of Munich, in his well-reasoned objections to the general cultivation of a taste for music and the fine arts, and in his hearty aversion for the prevalent disposition to magnify our social evils for the sake of platform popularity or the profits of sentimental fictions. Still, we would call increased attention to our great want, and reiterate the warning, *Educate—educate—educate*. As we lately heard Mr. Cobden emphatically say, "there is not a day, not an hour, to be lost."
J. R.

THE WORDS OF CHRIST.*

WE recollect reading, towards the close of the violent and feeble government of Charles X., the report of a trial and conviction, in one of the criminal courts of Paris, of a publisher of a work consisting of extracts from the New Testament of its parables and other moral lessons, to the exclusion of its narrative. The judge on passing sentence expatiated on the insidious spirit and mischievous tendency of the work. By publishing *la partie morale* alone, contempt of the miracles was insinuated, and so Christianity insulted. It was not suggested that the author had laid a foundation for this construction by anything he had himself said,—mere silence constituted the offence. An outrage this on the most obvious rules of justice which was in harmony with the spirit of that wretched government, which not even the grievous misconduct of its successor could render an object of regret. The silence of the judge who condemned justifies this conclusion; otherwise it might be suspected that the work was in fact, what it without evidence was accused of being, an indirect attack upon the supernatural portion of the gospel history.

A like imputation could not possibly be raised against the author of this excellent little book, though we suspect it cannot be looked upon with a favourable eye by the zealots of that theological school to which he professes to belong. It does not consist of a selection of Christ's words, but with a scrupulous completeness includes all that he has said; of necessity, therefore, all that respects his own nature and relation to the Father, and whatever of countenance his words give to orthodox

* The Words of Christ recorded by the Evangelists; being a Manual for all Christians. New Edition, revised. 8vo. Bogue, Fleet Street.

doctrine, is here to be found. Disregarding the inconvenience of inevitable tautology, the author, instead of adopting the form of a harmony, which at the first appears preferable, gives the contents of each Gospel successively,—a distribution which he justifies on the ground that it exhibits the words of Christ, “gradually and beautifully,” as a system of sacred ethics; “for the Gospels of Matthew and Mark are chiefly of moral bearing, that of Luke being more *political*, and that of John most *theological*.”

A copious table of contents indicates the import of Christ's words, and answers the purpose of an index; and the heading at the top of the page, such as “Words of Christ”—“To the Pharisees”—or “To the Multitude,” &c., supply a salutary hint for the just interpretation.

We will extract from the proem a few passages which will explain the object of the book and the spirit of the author, premising simply, that it consists altogether of Christ's words, with now and then, in a different type, the introductory narrative of the occasion, necessary for the clear understanding of the passage. That object is said to be to collect

“—all those rescripts of Christ which are significant and authoritative, independently of the narrative which contains them; . . . presuming that in so brief and condensed a form, they will carry conviction with new force into the mind, which is but too inclined to be diverted from the moral and main object by the amusing incidents of the history in which it is conveyed. . . . Thus separating that which, when rightly understood, being demonstrably true, must be LOGICALLY CERTAIN and incapable of contradiction, from that which, though being also historically true, is *simply credible* to the understanding, and liable therefore to be disputed. . . . Such analysis, by disengaging the *internal inspiration* of Christianity from the *external revelation*, disarms superstition, scepticism and infidelity, the enemies of true faith, and follows the admonitions of the Scriptures and of Christ himself by seeking the *spirit* rather than *signs and wonders*. Matt. xxiv. 24; Mark xiii. 22; Deut. xiii. 2.”

The author's position as a member of the Church may be inferred from the following:

“Although the essence of true religion is spiritual, of which ceremonies are but symbols, and Christianity, therefore, consists in its doctrine and spirit, of which its history is but the vehicle; while intent on developing its pure spirit, we are far from discarding either its true history or its reasonable rites, which are for ever secure; since man is in this life more sensual than spiritual, and has need of those external ordinances which are requisite to raise him through his sensible affections to the spiritual object of religious adoration.”

The judgment thus given in favour of Church rites and ordinances will, we suspect, scarcely obtain for the author the favour of the numerous body to which he belongs. For the same sort of suspicion which attaches to him who publishes the *partie morale* of the New Testament apart from its supernatural narrative, may be cast on him who presents the words of Christ alone without those of St. Paul, and the doctrines of the Gospels without those of the Epistles.

Among the sad consequences arising from the habit of considering every portion alike of the Scriptures as the “word of God,” irrespective of the object of the book or of the several persons who are the reputed authors, or whose words are merely therein recorded, as much authority is given to the words of the disciple as to those of the Master; and

the very men who elevate him even to the rank of Deity, at the same time reduce him below his most famous inspired apostle St. Paul as the author of their faith, for to him they especially trace those doctrines which are raised to such fearful importance in the subsequently established Christian churches. Many of these adherents to the popular orthodoxy will be startled, and perhaps offended, when they notice how infinitely small is the portion, especially of Calvinistic doctrine, which can be traced to Christ himself, and that only by means of forced constructions, and an extension of the doctrine of *reserve*, which they reprobate when applied by Newman to the Romanist doctrines. They are aware that Christ himself did, on especial occasions, decline making known to the public what was imparted to his disciples, and thought even them not yet qualified to receive full instruction. Yet they will be unprepared for so vast an extension of this reserve, even to the whole body of orthodox divinity, unless it be acknowledged that not only was St. John the forerunner of the Saviour as the announcer of his divine mission, but that he, the Saviour, was but the forerunner of St. Paul as the teacher, to whom was entrusted the task of making known the whole counsel of God. This thought will fill many with anger, while others of a gentler nature will feel only apprehension and grief at the mere suggestion.

We are far from supposing that such an application of this work has been contemplated by the author. We infer the contrary, not so much from anything on the face of the book itself, as because, though it is anonymous, yet we learn from the publisher's advertisement, that it is the work of Mr. George Field, a studious recluse, advanced in life, who, besides being the author of some highly-esteemed works on Chromatics, well known to artists and colour-makers, is also a metaphysician of the school farthest removed from the modern material or rational philosophy. He is the author also of a recent work of considerable pretension, entitled the "Logic of Analogy," which proposes to set up a third organ to be added to the syllogism of Aristotle and the induction of Bacon; and an earlier work, "Tritogenea, or a Synopsis of Universal Philosophy," exhibits him as one who would fain revive the systems of the mystical philosophers of antiquity. Like Schelling (but, we believe, without having derived anything in fact from the German transcendentalist), Mr. Field in his philosophy dictates a triplex classification of the whole field of speculation. It is but just, however, to remark, that however this ideal philosophy may have seduced other minds from a sober investigation of the Scriptures, or of human nature in its practical relations, it has permitted Mr. Field to direct his mind to the Gospels with no attempt to impose any construction derived from his peculiar metaphysical opinions. His Preface shews that his object is to exhibit the words of Christ as the prime source of all truth, as the Teacher in his life was the great exemplar.

EULOGISTS.

MANY eulogists prove antithetically the greatness of their idol by exhibiting their own littleness.—*A. W. Schlegel.*

ON THE BOOK OF JOB.

THIS is a poetical work on the justice of God. The thoughts that arise on seeing the good man suffer are thrown into a dramatic form, and the arguments for and against God's justice in the government of the world are put into the mouths of Job and his friends. The first two chapters are a prose narrative, and introduce the speeches.

In the land of Uz, in a part of Arabia to the south-east of Palestine, dwelt Job, or *the persecuted one*. He was a good man, who feared God. His wealth was counted in flocks of sheep, and camels, and oxen, and asses, and servants. He had seven sons and three daughters; and on their birthdays he offered burnt-offerings for them to God, lest they should have sinned in their hearts.

Now on a day when the sons of God, or the angels, presented themselves before Jehovah, Jehovah points out to Satan, or *the persecutor*, his servant Job as a man perfectly upright. Satan answers that he had observed him, but that his goodness was only for the sake of worldly reward. On this Jehovah puts into Satan's power all that Job has, that he may be tried; only Job himself is not to be touched. Job's troubles then begin. The Sabæans carry off his oxen; the lightning burns his sheep; the Chaldæans drive away his camels; the house falls upon the children and kills them all. Job bows himself before God in humility; the Lord gave and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord.

When Satan next presents himself before Jehovah, he refuses to acknowledge that Job has been really tried; and Jehovah then puts him wholly in Satan's power, only his life is to be spared. The unhappy man is thereupon afflicted with a most distressing leprosy from the crown of his head to the sole of his foot. His wife is no comfort to him, but reproaches him with the uselessness of his piety. Three friends come in to talk with him; and the speeches begin.

Job curses the day in which he was born, and wishes it blotted out of the year. He wishes that he had died at his birth, and had gone where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest (chap. iii.).

Eliphaz, one of his friends, asks him if he can listen to blame. He tells him that his piety should support him; the innocent never perish; but they that plough iniquity and sow wickedness reap the same. He tells him to trust in God, who woundeth and healeth; so shall he again be prosperous (chap. iv. v.).

Job answers that his sufferings are heavier than his friends are aware. He wishes for death, but says that he will speak in his distress, and complains against God (chap. vi. vii.).

Bildad, a second friend, denies that God is unjust. He says that Job's children must have sinned, and tells Job to make supplication to the Almighty (chap. viii.).

Job acknowledges that no man is just before God; but asserts his innocence. He will not, however, answer God, as there is no umpire to judge between them. He prays for death as a relief from his sufferings (chap. ix. x.).

Zophar, the third friend, blames Job for boasting. He wishes that God would speak and reprove him. He advises him to put away his iniquity, and then he need not fear (chap. xi.).

Job in answer denies that good and evil are sent as rewards and punishments. All nature contradicts it. God for his own purposes maketh judges foolish and overthroweth the strong; he raiseth up nations and destroyeth them. At length, urged on by the warmth of argument, Job says that he will speak, come what may; and tells his friends to listen while he pleads with God (chap. xii.—xiii. 19). He then makes his complaint against the Almighty. He begs him to withdraw his hand, that he may not be checked by fear; he will then either answer an accusation, or plead and wait for an answer. He complains that God is crushing the driven leaf, and pursuing the parched stubble; that man is weak and of a short life; and that after death he will not live again (chap. xiii. 20—xiv.).

Eliphaz in a second speech reproaches Job with impiety, and with turning against God. He quotes to him the opinion which wise men had declared, perhaps in the form of a poem, that trouble and anguish always overtake the wicked (chap. xv.).

Job answers that his friends are miserable comforters. He continues his laments and his assertions of innocence (chap. xvi. xvii.).

Bildad in his second speech continues the argument, that none but the wicked suffer, and asserts that this is the dwelling of him that knoweth not God (chap. xviii.).

Job now complains of his friends' cruel reproaches; his kinsmen have deserted him, his servants do not know him, his wife loathes him. But he is sure that hereafter God will avenge him (chap. xix.).

Zophar in his second speech returns to the same argument, that the triumph of the wicked is short, and that at last the heavens reveal his iniquity and the earth rises up against him (chap. xx.).

Job denies the truth of this argument, and says the wicked often thrive and are powerful; their houses are safe and their cows calve. We must not teach God, or undertake to say whom he should reward or whom he should punish (chap. xxi.).

Eliphaz in his third speech becomes yet more reproachful, and argues that Job's iniquities must be great; he has perhaps refused water to the thirsty or bread to the hungry. He advises him to return to God and be prosperous (chap. xxii.).

Job answers that his complaints are not made in rebellion. He mentions many cases in which the wicked prosper (chap. xxiii. xxiv.).

Bildad seems convinced, and in his third speech agrees with what Job has been saying, and shortly adds that no man is just in the sight of God (chap. xxv.).

Zophar ventures on no third speech in reply.

Job then reproves his friends' want of charity and their weakness of argument, and praises God's power (chap. xxvi.). As his friends still make no answer, he protests his sincerity and his innocence; he quotes his friends' opinion, that the wicked are always unprosperous, as altogether false. He praises Wisdom in a fine strain of poetry; silver and iron can be dug out of the mines, but where is wisdom to be found? its worth is above gold and jewels; wisdom is the fear of the Lord (chap. xxvii. xxviii.). As his friends still make no answer, he continues his reply; he describes his past prosperity (chap. xxix.), his present misfortunes (chap. xxx.), and again protests his innocence (chap. xxxi.).

Here a new person is introduced. Elihu, a young man who had

listened while his elders were speaking, takes up the argument. He says the old are not always wise. He blames the reasoning of the three friends, for though young he cannot help speaking (chap. xxxii.). He then addresses Job, and quotes his words to blame them. He says God's ways are not to be understood; pain is sometimes sent as a correction (chap. xxxiii.).

He further argues that God's ways are not unjust, but that man must bow in humility (chap. xxxiv.).

He blames Job for bargaining with God (chap. xxxv.).

He shews that God is just, that Job is sinful, and that God is to be feared and his wisdom is unsearchable (chap. xxxvi. xxxvii.).

Jehovah then answers Job out of the whirlwind in a series of questions. He describes the ocean, the storm, the stars and seasons, the lion, the rock-goat, the mule, the rhinoceros, the horse and the eagle, to shew that no man has knowledge enough to judge the ways of Providence (chap. xxxviii. xxxix.).

Jehovah then calls on Job to answer him (chap. xl. 1, 2).

Job acknowledges his worthlessness, and will attempt no answer (chap. xl. 3, 5).

Jehovah again calls on Job for an answer, and points out the wonders of the creation, the river-horse, the crocodile (chap. xl. xli.).

Job acknowledges that God's ways are too wonderful for him to understand, and repents in dust and ashes (chap. xlii. 1—6).

Lastly, Jehovah in wrath against the three friends, orders them to sacrifice a burnt-offering for their folly, and he restores Job to double his former prosperity.

The scenery and imagery of the poem are Arabian. They belong to the tribes dwelling on the borders of the desert, whose habits are simple and pastoral. But the religious thoughts are strictly Hebrew. Among any other people, perhaps, the inquiry would have been on the origin of evil, on matter being itself opposed to God's wishes, or on a wicked god whom the Ruler of the world was not wholly able to overcome. But here there is only one First Cause; Satan is a servant of the Almighty; the Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away, blessed is the name of the Lord.

The author's knowledge of geography and natural history reaches from the crocodile of the Nile to the river Jordan of Palestine (xl. 23); from deserts parched with the tropical sun, to regions of ice and snow. Judging from the numerous arts and sciences mentioned, it would seem to have been written after the Hebrew monarchy had risen to its prosperity—indeed, after the reign of Solomon. The writer mentions gold, silver, iron and copper, and the art of mining (xxviii. 1, 2), writing, and sculptured writing on stone (xix. 23). The sapphire stone had gained its present name (xxviii. 6) from the island of Sapphirene in the Red Sea. Landmarks were used to divide estates (xxiv. 2). Wheat and barley were cultivated (xxxi. 40). Oil and wine were made (xxiv. 11). Fields were ploughed and harrowed (xxxix. 10). Cattle were pledged for debt (xxiv. 3). Swift couriers and ships were in use (ix. 25). Cities (xv. 28), kings and judges (xii. 17) are mentioned; and it was the custom for an accusation to be made in writing (xxxi. 35). Mirrors were made of polished metal (xxxvii. 18). Music was produced by harps and pipes (xxx. 31), and in war by trumpets (xxxix. 24).

Soldiers wore shields made with bosses (xv. 26), and when their ranks were closed, would hold them lapping over one another like the scales of a crocodile (xli. 15). When we remember that working in iron was almost unknown to the Israelites in the reign of Saul (1 Samuel xiii. 19), we can hardly suppose a book with these marks of civilization written before the time of Solomon.

SAMUEL SHARPE.

THE LATE BISHOP STANLEY.*

THE life of Dr. Stanley deserved a record, chiefly on account of the intrinsic excellence of his character, and, in a lesser degree, on account of the light it throws on the ecclesiastical history of England during the second quarter of the 19th century. In his son, the admired author of the *Life of Arnold*, he has found a very able and reverential biographer. That the *Memoir* is free from the defects which commonly belong to filial biography, we do not assert. As it is almost exclusively confined to the public life of Dr. Stanley, and involves no family details, this is one of the cases in which the office of a biographer would have been better discharged by a friend rather than a son. Another preliminary remark, and we will proceed, with the help of the volume before us, to give some account of the late Bishop of Norwich. The temper of ecclesiastics is at the present time so jealous and irritable, and a clergyman of liberal sympathies, when writing on such topics as subscription to articles of faith, the reformation of the Liturgy, apostolical succession, and the claims of Dissenters, is so hampered by the difficulties of his position, that we could have wished the biographer of the late liberal Bishop of Norwich to have been a layman, that he might have treated those passages in the life which are disturbed by ecclesiastical controversy with that freedom and fearlessness which they demand, and which it is vain to look for in a clergyman.

Edward Stanley, the second son of Sir John Thomas Stanley, Bart., of Alderley Park, Cheshire, was born in London, Jan. 1, 1779. Sir John Thomas Stanley was the representative of an ancient branch of the Stanley family, which has been for many generations settled in Cheshire and attached to liberal principles. The baronetcy came into the family immediately after the Restoration, and was first enjoyed by the Thomas Stanley (born 1604, died 1672) who, notwithstanding his habitual caution and care to improve the family estate, was appealed to as an advocate for the Cheshire insurgents in 1658, and was the hospitable host of Oliver Heywood and John Angier when driven by persecution from their homes in 1666.

Like his friend Dr. Arnold, Edward Stanley early in life conceived a strong passion for the sea, and ever afterwards took a deep interest in naval affairs, a taste in both cases in singular contrast with the peaceful occupations of their lives. In the ardent boy who shed tears when he was not allowed to go on board the first ship which he beheld at Wey-

* Addresses and Charges of Edward Stanley, D.D. (late Bishop of Norwich). With a *Memoir* by his Son, Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of University College, Oxford. 8vo. Pp. 216. London—Murray.

mouth, and who as a child would leave his bed and sleep on the shelf of a wardrobe for the pleasure of imagining himself in a berth on board a man of war, we see the elements of the enthusiastic, resolute and self-denying man. In his early education he was not fortunate. His boyhood appears to have been frittered away in a series of unprofitable changes in private schools and under private tutors. The schools we may suppose were bad and the tutors incompetent; for when, in the twentieth year of his age, he was entered at St. John's College, Cambridge, he possessed "small Latin and less Greek," and a very slender modicum of mathematical knowledge. If the biographer have not, from his very natural partiality for public schools, exaggerated the ignorant condition of his father on his entrance at Cambridge, the case is a very remarkable one. He applied himself with such ardour to his new studies as to acquire a tolerable knowledge of the classical languages, and so great a proficiency in mathematics as enabled him to appear as a wrangler in the mathematical tripos of 1802.

That Edward Stanley's strong partiality for the sea was put aside in favour of a clerical life, for which in the first instance he appears to have had but indifferent qualifications, is, we suppose, to be accounted for by the possession by his family of the living of Alderley, which offered a convenient provision for the younger son (he was the youngest of seven children) of an aristocratic but not very wealthy family. It is not always or often that the experiment of entering into holy orders under such circumstances is attended with the beneficial results that followed the ordination of Mr. Stanley. He left Cambridge in 1802, and undertook, as a qualification for orders, the curacy of Windlesham, in Surrey. Before his ordination (as a priest, we presume), he travelled for a year in Switzerland, Italy, Spain and Portugal. His return to England was hastened by the anticipation of an invasion by Buonaparte, and by his brother's desire that he should take the command of a troop of volunteers raised on the family estate at Alderley. However unpropitious such an introduction might appear to the future clergyman of the parish, we can well conceive the ardour with which the patriotic youth would enter on, and the perseverance and strictness of discipline with which he would carry out, his martial duties. His slender and strikingly erect figure, his clear and powerful voice, and his strongly marked features, gave him great physical advantages as a military commander.

In 1805, he was presented by his brother (then Sir Thomas Stanley, created in 1839 Baron Stanley of Alderley) to the family living. He found the parish in a deplorable condition. At the beginning of the century, the clerical standard was everywhere low—nowhere lower than in Cheshire. "All who could afford it hunted; few, if any, rose above the ordinary routine of the stated services of the Church." Although the parish contained a population of 1300, there were seldom sufficient persons assembled at church to make a congregation. It was not uncommon for the clerk to leave the desk and go to the churchyard stile to see what prospect there was of a congregation. The inhabitants, exclusively of the family at the Hall, consisted of farmers and their labourers. The ignorance and irreligious habits of the people were at first most discouraging. There was no Sunday-school, and at the parish school the pupils were few, and were badly and irregularly taught. The

surrounding clergy not only offered neither the example nor incentives to ministerial zeal and usefulness, but were disposed to put down every attempt to introduce new and better parochial and religious plans by that word, so unpalatable to ears both orthodox and genteel, "Methodistical!" These were the difficulties and discouragements of the young Rector of Alderley when he entered on the duties of the parish. On the other hand, he had a delightful residence, in the midst of a picturesque and salubrious district; he was cordially supported by his brother in all his parish plans; he had health and remarkable power of enduring fatigue; his social position added largely to his personal and professional influence; and, above all, he had a strong sense of duty, and invincible perseverance in accomplishing whatever he undertook. In one respect, the parish of Alderley was very different forty-five years ago from what it now is. It was a secluded village, little affected by the influences of the industrious and increasing population of Manchester, from which it is *now* distant little more than half-an-hour's journey. The residents, mostly of a humble class, were not given to Dissent, nor disposed to question the wisdom or oppose the plans of the brother of the Squire. He commenced his parochial reform by promoting education. In 1807, a Sunday-school was established. With difficulty he gathered at first about 50 or 60 children. Before he left the parish, he had the pleasure of seeing more than 200 scholars. Instead of one or two inconvenient rooms, which were all the accommodation for the day-scholars which the parish possessed when he came to the living, four or five school-houses were erected, two of them spacious and convenient, in which 250 children received daily instruction, being more than a sixth of the whole population. He directed and personally watched the management and progress of his schools. Long before it was generally adopted, he introduced at Alderley the attractive gymnastic furniture of the play-ground. He encouraged the teachers in the extension of the subjects of instruction. English history, geography, botany and natural history, were taught with considerable success. A hortus siccus of the plants growing in the parish, formed by one of the female pupils, was exhibited by him at a lecture on Education in Chester, as a proof of the usefulness of instruction in botany. He appointed in all the schools half-yearly examinations, at which the children were expected to repeat a chapter from the New Testament, and undergo a close examination on one or more books of the Old or New Testament. Once a year prizes were distributed, and this was indeed a festal and happy day for the children. A dinner at the Rectory and amusements in the grounds, or a row in the Rector's boat on the beautiful mere, made the children happy indeed. But the richest reward which the young scholar could gain was the Rector's well-known smile and his gentle tap on the head. Bibles and other religious books were freely distributed or sold at a reduced price to the parishioners. A good parochial library was open for the use of all who made application. The bodily wants and comforts of the poor were not forgotten by him. Large assistance was given to his poor neighbours, when he knew them to be respectable, honest and industrious. By personal application at the Rectory every morning, not later than nine o'clock, the well-conducted poor might purchase blankets, shoes and various articles of clothing, at two-thirds of the prime cost. In

the early years of this experiment, this boon was offered to all the inhabitants who needed it; but when he found that it did not exercise any reformatory influence on the idle, the drunken and the dishonest, he confined the charity to those whom he knew to be deserving objects. In pastoral visits he was most assiduous, putting himself into communication with every inhabitant of his parish. In his pulpit addresses, which were soon listened to by large and deeply-attentive audiences, he was very plain and habitually practical. The description of his happy and eminently useful and admirable portion of Mr. Stanley's life must, at the cost of a little repetition, be given in the language of his son.

"His visits to the poor were made in weekly rounds, according to a regular distribution of the parish, by which every house was included in systematic order, without waiting, as was probably at that time the usual practice in the vicinity, for the calls of the sick or dying. But it was not so much by the frequency as by the manner of those visits that he made himself not only the minister but the friend of his parishioners. Without losing for a moment the advantage which birth and station always give to an English gentleman in his dealings with the poor, he yet descended to the level of their tastes and pursuits—he entered into their humour, and tried to make them enter into his—he caressed their children, and through them won the hearts of the parents—he accommodated his addresses in the pulpit and his conversation in the cottages to their simple apprehensions—he spoke to them of their common pursuits and cares as if he were one of themselves; and the result was that they were cheered and animated by his presence and his active interest in their welfare, as well as warned and consoled by his instructions. When he looked into the schools, it was not merely to glance round the classes, or to ask a few formal questions, to see that all was in order, but he had something to say to each individual scholar, of encouragement or rebuke. In his rides round the parish the children used to run out of the houses to catch the wonted smile, or gesture, or call, of the Rector as he passed, or to claim the cakes and gingerbread that he brought with him for those whose hands and faces were clean; and the poor cottagers long afterwards described how their hearts beat with delight as they heard the short quick trampling of his horse's feet as he went galloping up their lanes, and the sound of his voice as he called out to them before he reached the house to come out and speak to him, or hold his pony as he went in. 'When he entered a sick chamber he never failed to express the joy which neatness and order gave him, or to reprove where he found it otherwise.' Whatever was to be done in the parish for their good, they were sure to find in him an active supporter. 'He took so much trouble,' they said, 'in whatever he did—never sparing himself for whatever he took in hand.' The Rectory became the 'home' of the parish. He sold daily at his house, to the honest and industrious poor, blanketing, clothing, &c., at a cheaper rate than the cost price (a practice then much less frequent in country parishes than at present). In the winter evenings he lent out books to read; and generally for anything that was wanted, whether in the way of advice or relief, his house was the constant resort of all who were in difficulty. He established weekly cottage lectures at different points in the parish for the old and infirm who were unable to walk to church.

"In the hope of producing an effect upon those who were less likely to be impressed by the usual ministrations of the Church, he used from time to time to issue printed or lithographed addresses to his parishioners on Observance of the Sabbath, on Prayer, on Sickness, on Confirmation. In the public-houses, with the same view, he caused large placards to be framed, containing a few short and simple exhortations to a sober and religious life, such as might arrest the attention of the passer-by; and on the walls and public places of the parish he had similar papers posted up, denouncing in strong

language (what was a crying sin of the country population of Cheshire) the vice of drunkenness. To repress this great evil he spared no personal sacrifice. 'Whenever,' such was the homely expression of the people, 'whenever there was a drunken fight down at the village, and he knew of it, he would always come out to stop it—there was such a spirit in him.' On one of these occasions tidings were brought to him of a riotous crowd which had assembled to witness a desperate prize-fight, adjourned to the outskirts of his parish, and which the respectable inhabitants were unable to disperse. 'The whole field' (so one of the humbler neighbours represented it) 'was filled, and all the trees round about—when in about a quarter of an hour I saw the Rector coming up the road on his little black horse as quick as lightning, and I trembled for fear they should harm him. He rode into the field and just looked quick round (as if he thought the same) to see who there was that would be on his side. But it was not needed—he rode into the midst of the crowd, and in one moment it was all over; there was a great calm; the blows stopped; it was as if they would all have wished to cover themselves up in the earth—all from the trees they dropped down directly—no one said a word, and all went away humbled.' The next day he sent for the two men, not to scold them, but to speak to them, and sent them each away with a Bible. The effect on the neighbourhood was very great, and put a stop to the practice, which had been for some time past prevalent in the adjacent districts."—Pp. 12—15.

During the latter years of his incumbency at Alderley, Dr. C. J. Blomfield was appointed to the see of Chester. The new Bishop was considered a somewhat imperious and despotic spiritual overseer, and at the periodical gatherings in his presence, unfriended curates and the lesser clergy often trembled, like boys before a harsh schoolmaster. In Chester cathedral, the painful and degrading spectacle was once seen of a poor clergyman weeping in consequence of the public and harsh rebuke of his Ordinary for not having remembered to bring to the visitation his hymn-book for episcopal inspection and approbation. A strong feeling pervaded the diocese that some check should be given to the arbitrary proceedings of the Bishop. It is remembered to the honour of Mr. Stanley that he first stood up to vindicate the rights of his order, in which, as it happened, the religious liberty of one of his catechumens was involved. The Bishop had forbidden his clergy to bring up children for confirmation below a certain age. In this proceeding he overstepped the rules of the Church, which specifies no precise age, but speaks of "years of discretion," and makes certain religious knowledge the test of that discretion. Mr. Stanley thought that it was expedient that a particular scholar, somewhat under the age prescribed by the Bishop, should be presented for confirmation, being well aware that her religious knowledge was far beyond her years. The quick eye of the Bishop at once observed the infraction of his rule, and, without asking an explanation, directed her to retire. The Rector, respecting his own independence and the rights of his scholar more than the favour of the Bishop, replaced her at the head of his class, and, with the Rubric in his hands respecting Confirmation, walked up with her to receive confirmation, which the Bishop, thus rebuked, did not think proper to refuse. This anecdote, which is *not* to be found in the Memoir, and which has probably never before appeared in print, we are the more desirous to place before our readers, because it exhibits a high moral courage in the subject of this Memoir, which on one or two more important occasions he failed to command.

The duties of his parish, laboriously as he discharged them, did not exhaust his energies. He was somewhat of a student, making the Scriptures, ecclesiastical history, and especially physical science, the objects of his attention.

"The exhibition of Divine power and goodness in the natural world seemed to him so much more direct and simple than amidst the perplexities and confusion of the moral world, that he always regarded it as one of the purest sources of intellectual and religious instruction; and always studied and encouraged it as a natural part of a clergyman's duty, and as conducive, when it could be followed up, to the welfare of his flock also. 'The perversions of men,' he used to say, 'would have made an infidel of me, but for the counter-acting impressions of Divine Providence in the works of nature.' Of all the branches of science, natural history was that to which he was most inclined. His quick eye enabled him readily to observe, and his methodical habits accurately to register, the phenomena of the animal creation; and thus to acquire, without interfering with any graver pursuits, a very considerable knowledge of ornithology, entomology, and mineralogy. Ornithology in particular became his favourite study, and it was a constant source of amusement and interest to him in his parish walks and rides to notice the flights and habits of birds, to collect remarkable specimens of their organization, and to gather from his parishioners stories of any peculiarities which they had themselves noticed. The result of these observations he embodied, in 1836, in two small volumes, published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and entitled '*A Familiar History of Birds, their Nature, Habits, and Instincts.*'"—Pp. 16, 17.

He did not think it unbecoming to his personal rank and professional character to promote, elsewhere than in his parish, Infant Schools, Temperance Societies, Mechanics Institutions and Statistical Societies. Of the British Association for promoting Science he was a zealous supporter. We remember some years ago hearing an anecdote connected with his attendance at one of these scientific festivals. At the meeting at Cambridge, the members were entertained in one of the splendid halls of the University. Seated by the side of Mr. Stanley was, to all appearance, a clergyman of venerable figure and very gentle manners. They talked together on various subjects, until Mr. Stanley inquired to which of these noble halls of learning the gentleman whom he addressed belonged. The stranger replied, that he had been precluded from the privilege of studying either there or at Oxford, that he was no clergyman, but simply a Dissenting minister. Mr. Stanley, in his frank way, grasped the hand of his neighbour, and said, with a fervour that did him honour, "And I don't think a bit the worse of you, Sir, for that!" It will not diminish our readers' interest in this story, to know that the Dissenting minister was the Rev. William Turner, of Newcastle.

He is believed to have been the first clergyman who gave a public lecture on Geology. This was at Macclesfield. He took a warm interest in all public questions in which he conceived the rights and comforts of considerable bodies to be involved. In 1829, he appeared, through the press, as an advocate of Catholic Emancipation. Two years after, he appeared as a Church reformer; and, at a meeting of the clergy of Cheshire, carried a petition, eventually signed by about forty clergymen, praying for the abolition of pluralities, non-residence, &c. It was as characteristic of, as discreditable to, the Bishop of the diocese, that he refused to present this petition to the Sovereign; although, under influences which Kings and Bishops cannot resist, this

same ecclesiastic has subsequently assisted to carry into effect nearly every reform asked for in this petition. In questions of party politics, Mr. Stanley was not in the habit of concealing his opinions, but in a calm manner gave the friends of progress and reform the benefit of his counsel and support. In a county where nine-tenths of the resident gentry are fanatically Tory, as in Cheshire, this was greatly to his credit. Mr. Penrhyn Stanley somewhat understates the fact, limiting his father's public appearance on a political question to an election for the county of Anglesea. We well remember the valuable and efficient support Mr. Stanley gave, in the election previous to the Reform Bill, to Mr. Geo. Wilbraham. We have no sympathy with the morbid feeling that clergymen and ministers of religion ought to refrain from the exercise of their civil rights and the free expression of their political opinions. When unprincipled agitators stirred up the passions of the mob, exciting them to violate the law and destroy property, Mr. Stanley came forward to expose them, and to persuade the people to follow wiser counsels.

Thus did Mr. Stanley pursue his blameless and dignified and benevolent career as the Rector of Alderley for upwards of thirty years. His influence in the parish was boundless, and his name was now known in many parts of the kingdom as a philanthropist and a religious and social reformer. A change was at hand which, while it called him to tread a wider and more important stage, threatened to deprive him of tranquillity and peace.

On the death, in the spring of 1837, of Dr. Bathurst, the venerable Bishop of Norwich, Lord Melbourne not unnaturally wished to secure for the vacant diocese the services of Mr. Stanley. Negotiations had previously been carried on respecting the intended Bishopric of Manchester. Mr. Stanley realized the pangs which a separation from his beloved Alderley would involve, and deliberated long and doubtfully. Not often is a *Nolo Episcopari* so sincere as his. He felt that the sphere of labour which awaited him was uncongenial. Episcopal "restraints and formalities" were irksome to his free and unreserved manners and habits. It is an interesting fact, stated by his son, that when he waited on the Premier to announce his acceptance of the appointment, he was completely overcome; and it is not less creditable to the memory of Lord Melbourne (a statesman grievously misunderstood and unjustly depreciated by Miss Martineau in her *History of the Thirty Years' Peace*), that he was greatly touched by this good clergyman's emotion, and told him he had gone through a not dissimilar feeling on taking office. In addition to all the motives at home to dissuade him from changing his state, could Dr. Stanley have foreseen the coarse and malignant persecution to which he was to be exposed by clerical bigotry in fulfilling the duties of the Episcopate, it is more than probable that he would have resolved to live and die Rector of Alderley.

There was one comfort with which the departing Rector solaced himself which proved an entire delusion. In his parting Address to his parishioners he said, "He who is about to follow me and become your pastor, is one long and well known to me for his practical piety, his active zeal and his Christian character; one who is leaving a parish of 8000 people equally affected at his loss. To him I feel that I can confide my flock as to a shepherd who will watch over them, and guide

them with fidelity and affection." How changed an aspect the parish soon presented is already widely known. The conciliatory policy so successfully pursued for one-and-thirty years was abandoned; supposed clerical dues were demanded to the last penny; the parish was instantly in a state of war; the church was deserted, the schools neglected, the clock was stopped, the bells ceased to ring, and the organ was no longer used. Instead of the friendly intercourse between the Rectory and the Hall, there was the strife of law. Lord Stanley and his family were forced to worship in a neighbouring parish church. Dissent, which in the good Rector's days had all but entirely disappeared, sprung into immediate activity, three Nonconformist places of worship arising in or in the immediate vicinity of the parish. These were the consequences of the enforcement of what are called "Church principles." And yet men, the loudest in their profession of zeal for the Church, thought themselves justified in assailing Bishop Stanley as a promoter of schism and a favourer of Dissent! Who are really the schismatics in this case it is not difficult to decide.

It is certain that Dr. Stanley performed the laborious offices of his extensive diocese with unflinching zeal, and in a spirit of fidelity rarely surpassed. Under ordinary circumstances, any little jealousy of his supposed latitudinarianism, and the "orthodox" resentment against his too catholic spirit, would have soon subsided and given place to honest admiration of his earnest labours in carrying into effect his views of episcopal duty. But he had fallen on evil times and evil tongues. Alarmed at the progress of reform, and inflamed with passion at being deprived of that monopoly of power and influence and preferment which, with few interruptions, had for two generations been enjoyed by men of their order or party, and especially indignant at the admission of Dissenters to full civil rights, the clergy in many parts of the country, and especially in the University of Oxford, combined to decry and denounce as enemies to the Church all who upheld liberal principles. Those that were selected for Church preferment and ecclesiastical honours by a "latitudinarian Government," were the objects of especial dislike and industrious slander.

"Men whose life, learning, faith and pure intent,
Would have been held in high esteem with Paul,
Must now be named and printed Hereticks."

Both Dr. Maltby and Dr. Stanley were assailed with unsparing clamour. The former, at the instigation, as is now believed, of a few clerical agitators, was burnt in effigy by a ruffian mob before the gates of his own palace. To gratify their evil passions, many of the clergy forgot their favourite doctrine of the submission due to episcopal authority, and, to mark their dislike of the men, offered insult to the episcopal office. The real offence in both was, their unconcealed aversion to High-Church principles and exclusive practices. As respects Dr. Stanley, there was not the slightest ground for imputing to him any departure from the received doctrines of the Church. He could not, indeed, in any comprehensive sense of the term, be considered as a theologian. He was indisposed, through the defects of his early education as well as by the natural bent of his genius, for subtle views, whether in philosophy or theology. His son very fairly describes the qualities of his mind in this matter: "Though giving a full practical assent to the creed and worship of the Church of England, he never

could endure minute controversies relating to the details of its doctrines and ceremonies." But it requires almost Bishop Stanley's mental constitution to comprehend the process by which he put aside theological difficulties and satisfied himself as to the safety of his position. Without attempting to vindicate the consistency of his opinions, or even to explain his process of self-vindication, we would emphatically assert our belief in the perfect integrity of his purpose and mind. On some of the doctrines of his Church he appears to have attained to a faith satisfactory to himself, by considerations purely æsthetic, wholly irrespective of any logical process or the evidence of scripture. "To one who had sent for him in the prospect of approaching death, and expressed perplexity at various difficulties as to our Lord's Divinity" (we suppose *Deity* is meant here), "he begged to hear them enumerated. This was done, one after another; and when it was concluded, he asked whether anything yet remained? 'No,' was the reply. 'Then,' said he, 'I do not answer one of your difficulties. I grant them all. They are difficulties. I cannot explain them. But now let me ask you one question. Do you, in the prospect of death, feel that anything can give you confidence and support in such an hour but the belief that Christ is God?'" (P. 53.) How, with this state of mind, he could reconcile it with truth and duty to repeat, as expressive of his own belief, the precise and intensely dogmatic creeds of his Church on the subject of the Deity of Christ, we do not, as already intimated, profess to explain. His son tells us that he was accustomed to recur to the contrast presented by the Bible, in its simplicity and freedom, to the elaborate systems of later divinity. (P. 16.) If there be this contrast, it ought to follow, by logical sequence, that the person perceiving it should dissent from the systems of later divinity. But Dr. Stanley felt no such necessity of dissent. He was satisfied with the theory which has proved an opiate to many minds far more speculative than his—that the Church of England is essentially comprehensive in its spirit, and that her Articles are purposely framed so as to include persons holding on some important points widely different views.

No Prelate, since the days of Bishop Hoadly, has more plainly expressed his conviction that the Church of England is founded on liberty of conscience and the right of private judgment. No one holding high rank in the Church has more clearly shewn the necessity of relaxing the terms of subscription. In his place in the House of Lords he declared, that though he had conversed with very many clergymen on the subject of their subscription to the Articles of the Church, he had never met with one who professed to agree in every point and in every iota to the subscription which he took at ordination. (P. 101.) But, in the estimation of his enemies, the great wrong done by Bishop Stanley to his Church was, the low views he took on the priestly character and office. A dominant and intolerant priesthood he declared to be "one of the greatest evils that could be inflicted on a Christian community." (P. 92.) The doctrine of Apostolical Succession he twice emphatically repudiated: first, on the occasion of preaching in St. Paul's, before the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, a sermon characterized, at the civic banquet which followed, as the boldest that had ever been delivered in St. Paul's Cathedral; and secondly, in his Charge to his Clergy, at the Septennial Visitation in 1845. He considered the doctrine of Apostolical Succession to be one which would not

bear minute inquiry, and calculated to alienate the minds of close-reasoning and calmly-reflecting men. His words are on this subject too important to be soon forgotten :

“Let me remind you, in the first place, of the great uncertainty which hangs over the very beginning of this supposed chain of apostolical descent, which in its very first origin has no authority whatever in the New Testament to rest upon, and in its successive links is involved in such obscurity and perplexity, that no one yet has been able to disentangle the confusion; and this is surely enough to make us pause before we make so slender a basis the foundation of so vast a superstructure. And when to this we add the manifold corruptions, both of faith and practice, into which the Greek, Roman, and other early Churches have fallen, it is difficult to see how any member of the Church of England can regard the possession of this so-called succession in the light of a safeguard to purity of life or orthodoxy of doctrine. It is true that in the minds of disinterested, single-minded, and humble-hearted Christians it may be productive of no evil results, but disinterested, single-minded, and humble-hearted men have not been in times past, and may not be again in times to come, its exclusive maintainers; and your own experience will suggest what have been and may again be the consequences, when such a doctrine is cherished by men covetous of power, given to intrigue, influenced by ambition and worldly self-interested principles. And further, let me call to your remembrance that this doctrine is not to be found in our Liturgy, Articles, and Homilies—that the Reformers (generally speaking), with Cranmer at their head, were opposed to it, expressly disclaiming it, and maintaining, not once only, but often, that the only true apostolicity was apostolicity of faith and practice, and that the only true apostolical succession was a succession of apostolical doctrine and apostolical purity.

“And, in conclusion, let me ask its advocates, even were the arguments against it less overwhelming than they are, whether, in these days, it is sound policy to press as an established principle of our Church, that, unless we can trace our ministerial pedigree through some of those very same foul channels by which the Romish priesthood exercised a fatal sway over the liberties and consciences of mankind for so many centuries, we have neither right nor title to be considered authorized teachers of the Gospel?—In a word, that piety and devotion in our calling, without this apostolical succession, are but the ‘hay and stubble’ of our claims to be a legitimate priesthood? Is it wise, rather is it Christian, to insist, in these days, that the laity are bound to reverence and obey as ministers those who may be without moral fitness for their office, solely on their claim to be in direct succession from the Apostles? Let us pause before we are over earnest in pressing claims so liable to excite the contempt of that large discriminating portion of society who feel that it is not upon such grounds as this that our pure Protestant Church of England was built, and now stands.”—Pp. 131*, 132*.

Much as the clergy resented this bold doctrine, the highest spirits of them saw the inexpediency of putting their quarrel with the Bishop on an issue which would certainly conciliate to him a large amount of intelligent sympathy. To men in their temper, the occasion of offence must inevitably have arisen. With eager joy they seized hold of an incident, trifling enough in itself, but which gave them the opportunity of holding up both him and the equally obnoxious Bishop of Durham as the patrons and abettors of heresy. The story shall be told in the language of the Bishop's son.

“In the autumn of 1838 he had been requested by an old Unitarian minister at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, with whom he had accidentally formed an acquaintance through mutual friends in Cheshire, to subscribe to a volume of sermons about to be published as a kind of celebration of the fifty-seventh

anniversary of his ministerial duties. The Bishop, reluctant to withhold a personal compliment from an old man whose general character he had reason to respect, consented to take a copy; adding, however, with greater caution perhaps than was habitual to him, a distinct condition that his name should not be inserted in the list of subscribers, for the obvious reason that, by those who did not know the circumstances of the case, his motives might be misrepresented, and his respect for the individual construed into an approval of the doctrines of the sect. This instruction was disregarded; and the publication of the name of the Bishop of Norwich, with that of another Prelate of the Establishment—first in the provincial and then in the London journals—as heading a list of subscribers to a volume of Unitarian sermons, with some slight unintentional variations from the truth which naturally gave a false colour to the transaction, was caught up by those who were otherwise opposed to him as a new proof of the heterodoxy of their Bishop. The storm raged with considerable vehemence, both within and without the Diocese; and though somewhat allayed by a published correspondence between the Bishop and one of his chaplains, in which the true facts of the case were stated, lingered long before it was entirely forgotten either by him or by his opponents.” Pp. 61, 62.

It is our belief that the want of moral courage shewn on this occasion by both Prelates (a want reflected now on Bishop Stanley's biographer), instead of lulling the storm of bigotry, increased the efforts of those who had set it in motion. They might have rebuked the foul spirit of their persecutors with calm dignity. Precedents of unquestionable authority might have been adduced, embodying the sentiments and example of many Bishops, some of them ornaments of their Church. Archbishop Tillotson, Bishops Secker, Herring and Boulter, Archbishop Newcome and Bishop Bathurst, might have been named as justifying, by their example, far more than the slender act of civility paid by the two Bishops to Mr. Turner. A fine opportunity of rebuking bigotry was more than lost. His son frankly admits that, as regards Dr. Stanley, these outbreaks of bigotry exercised a serious effect on the Bishop's after course. (P. 57.) A painful and paralyzing recollection of them clung to him; the natural freedom of his sanguine nature was repressed and his powers of action cramped. It was more than once felt by members of Unitarian churches, that, catholic as Bishop Stanley's sympathies were to others, his intercourse with them, after the clerical persecution of 1838, was constrained and cold. Who can doubt that the painful incidents of 1838 paralyzed the sympathies, though they could not the sense of justice, of the Bishop of Norwich, in the speech which, in 1844, he delivered in the House of Lords in defence of his vote for the Dissenters' Chapels Bill? In that timid and uncharacteristic address, how strange from those lips were expressions almost amounting to religious animosity against the religious denomination whom his vote was designed to protect and benefit! We well remember retiring from the House of Lords on that occasion, as well as from a previous personal interview with the Bishop on the subject of the Bill, with the painful feeling that the moral atmosphere in which he had been breathing during the eight preceding years, had not been favourable to his intellectual vision or to his moral courage. We gave utterance to the wish that if other clergymen existed in England as liberal and bold as the Rector of Alderley once was, they might be delivered from the temptations of episcopal life.

We will give a passing utterance to a sentiment which has more than once risen to our minds while reading this interesting Memoir.

Familiarity with the secret workings and indirect influences of a religious establishment does not enhance its loveliness. All that was fine and noble in Bishop Stanley belonged to the *man*, not to the system. The system of the Church Establishment was often a fetter and a snare to him. There is a deep utterance from a wounded spirit in these words of the Bishop: "I came into the Diocese, not with the expectation of finding it a bed of roses, but rather a bed of thorns; but my greatest trials arise from those of the clergy who are loudest in their cry of 'the Church in danger,' but who never do anything to keep it from danger." (P. 33.) Lamentable is it that so much of the energy and something of the goodness of this excellent man were sacrificed to the petty controversies of an Established Church. Had he vindicated for himself by Dissent the free action of a Wesley, a Channing or a Baptist Noel, who can doubt that he would have attained a still more exalted Christian stature?

In 1849, Dr. Stanley reached the allotted term of threescore years and ten. Although his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated, there were not wanting some premonitory signs of an approaching change. When, in the autumn of that year, he was paying a visit to the Honourable Mrs. Stuart Mackenzie, of Brahan Castle, in Ross-shire, he was attacked by congestion of the brain—the penalty of unintermitted mental activity. For a week or two, there was a struggle between life and death; but in the evening of September the 5th, he gently breathed his last. He was mercifully removed in time to be spared some parental agony. A few weeks before, his youngest son was cut off by fever in Van Dieman's Land; and early in the following year, his eldest son, Captain Owen Stanley, of H. M. S. *Rattlesnake*, suddenly expired, on receiving at Sydney the intelligence of his father's death, his constitution having been previously undermined by his professional toils and by grief at his brother's death.

The remains of the Bishop were consigned, not to the lovely churchyard of Alderley—fitting resting-place for one whose enduring distinction will be as the good Rector of that parish—but were buried in the centre of the nave of the cathedral at Norwich.

"At the same hour as that in which the cathedral bell announced to the city of Norwich that the mournful ceremony had begun, a funeral knell was tolled in the humbler church of a far distant parish, which awakened a grief as sincere and as touching as the more public manifestation of sorrow at Norwich. From the moment that the sad tidings had reached Alderley, the whole place was overcast with mourning. During the twelve years since it had lost its beloved Rector, many changes, inward and outward, had come over it, and the number of those with whom he was personally acquainted was necessarily diminished. But the grateful recollection of him, always kept alive by his annual visits, still remained; and many a cottage was darkened, and many an eye filled with tears amongst those who felt that the same event which had left vacant a place amongst the prelates of England, had deprived each of them individually of a dear and devoted friend. Nor had they been forgotten by him. With the documents discovered after his death were found, besides those which have been already mentioned, relating to the funeral at Norwich, two addresses—one to the parishioners, the other to the school-children, of Alderley, written about a year before his removal to the see, and countersigned by him about seven years afterwards, with a request that a copy of each might be sent after his death to every house in the parish."—Pp. 105, 106.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Introductory Lessons on Christian Evidences. Seventh Edition. 1846.

Introductory Lessons on the History of Religious Worship. Being a Sequel to the Lessons on Christian Evidences, by the same Author. Parts I. and II. 1849.

Introductory Lessons on the Study of the Apostle Paul's Epistles. 1849. London—John W. Parker.

THESE little works, drawn up for the young (it is understood by Archbishop Whately), are admirable familiarizations, and at the same time valuable compends, of the most interesting and important knowledge. The best service we can do for the class for whose use they are intended, is to indicate their contents, and earnestly recommend their perusal.

The first of them treats of the Rise of Christianity; Faith and Credulity; Ancient Books; Prophecies; Miracles: then follows a summary of these Evidences. It proceeds with Internal Evidences; Objections; and closes with two Lessons on the Modern Jews.

The contents of Part. I. of the Introductory Lessons on the History of Religious Worship, are, Mankind originally instructed from Heaven; the Pagan Religions; the Mosaic Dispensation; Introduction of the Gospel; the Establishment of Christ's Kingdom.

The contents of Part II. are, Corruptions of Christianity; Reformations in Religion; Church Allegiance and Separations.

The Lessons on the Epistles are in six chapters, taking them in historical order, except, perhaps, that 1 Timothy and Titus are put too late, and a journey of the Apostle subsequent to his imprisonment at Rome too much taken for granted; while, on the other hand, the date of the Epistle to the Galatians is perhaps too little so taken. The Epistle to the Hebrews, though silently classed with the apostle Paul's, is throughout spoken of impersonally.

The profession of the Lessons on the Evidences to exclude matter of controversy between different churches, has been excellently kept; and, without that profession, the same exclusion appears in the Lessons on the Epistles. It has not been so easy, perhaps it was scarcely possible, in the History of Religious Worship. Yet we think it need not have included the following (Lesson iv. p. 84, Part I.):

“And it is worth remarking, that they also understood his calling Himself ‘the Son of God,’ and saying, ‘that God was his *own proper* * Father,’ † as a claim to be a divine person. His words, indeed, might, in themselves, conceivably, bear another meaning. But He must have *known* that *they* so understood Him. And if they had mistaken his meaning, He would not have failed to correct their mistake: else He would have been bearing false witness against Himself.”

“They *rightly* understood Him, therefore, to be claiming a divine character. And thereupon they pronounced him guilty of blasphemy,‡ and liable to death by their law,§ as teaching men to worship another besides the true God.”

“For they did not expect that the Christ was to be a *divine* person; as is plain from their being unable to solve the question which Jesus puts to them, about David's calling him Lord.|| When, therefore, they understood Him to ‘make Himself God,’ ¶ this was so far from favouring their belief in Him as the Christ, that it convinced them of his being a false pretender and a blasphemous.”

It is amazing that such a man as Dr. Whately can be so suppressive, incomplete, and therefore falsely conclusive, as this.

First, *Jesus* did not say that God was his *own proper* Father; they are the

* The original shews that these words should be supplied.

† John v. 18.

‡ Matt. xxvi. 65.

§ Deut. xviii.

|| Mark xii. 37.

¶ John x. 33.

words which the Jews chose to attribute to him: Jesus had simply said "*my Father!*" and the whole remainder of John v. (19 to end), beginning (ver. 19), "*the Son can do nothing of himself,*" is a disclaimer to the Jews, on the part of our Lord, of original divine powers. And in John x., when the Jews (sincerely or otherwise) understood him to "*make himself God,*" Jesus answered them, "*Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken; say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?*"

How, then, can Dr. Whately deliberately say that Jesus did not correct the mistake, and that the Jews *rightly* understood him as claiming a divine character or person? But his conclusion is more glaring still. *Rightly* so understanding him, he says, "*they pronounced him guilty of blasphemy and liable to death by their law:*" not expecting the Christ to be a *divine* person, his claiming to be such at once convinced them of his being a false Christ and a blasphemer. So, then, God in His law and providence trained them to a *human* Christ, and actually sends, or comes, to them a *divine* one; and then, because they obey His law in rejecting a *divine* one, He rejects *them!* (to say nothing of a *divine* death in the process!) To what monstrous conclusions do false beginnings lead! Nothing can more thoroughly expose the fallacy of the argument attempted to be set up, of a distinction between the import of the title *Christ* and *Son of God* in the mind of Jesus himself, and that our Lord in the latter title considered a divinity in his nature to be implied. It is an argument elaborately undertaken in a book published in 1797, entitled, "*An Illustration of the Method of explaining the New Testament by the early Opinions of Jews and Christians concerning Christ.*" By William Wilson, B.D., of St. John's College, Cambridge,"—a work evidently called forth by Dr. Priestley's labours of preceding years. It was reprinted in 1838; and to it we may clearly trace Dr. Whately's argument, first in his "*Kingdom of Christ delineated,*" &c., published in 1841 (see *Christian Reformer*, 1842, pp. 38, 104), and next in the smaller work now reviewed. (See works enumerated at end of the Lesson, p. 96.) The argument entirely neglects the *moral* controversy between our Lord and the Jews, and attributes to a difference of *nature* on his part, what is simply a difference of temper and spirit. This considered, the simple scripture is perfectly intelligible, and Divine Providence with the Jews clearly justified.

In the little work before us, the argument occurs in the midst of another, quite distinct, and might have been omitted without loss to it. That other argument is a fanciful suggestion founded on our Lord's use of the word *temple* in reference to himself (John ii. 21), whence the Archbishop has a vision of three temples, viz. the temple at Jerusalem, Christ's body, and the whole body of Christians, in which, respectively, he thus makes each person in a Trinity (for it is not the orthodox Trinity) to have been manifested (p. 85):

"The same God then who, to the Israelites, was made known only as *Creator and Governor* (God the *Father*), was afterwards manifested to Christians as being also the *Redeemer* (God the *Son*), and the *Sanctifier* (God the Holy Ghost): and He is to be acknowledged by them in this threefold manifestation, according to our Saviour's injunction to '*baptize in* the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*'" (N.B. Dr. Hinds's book, "*The Three Temples of the One God contrasted,*" is among the books from which this Lesson was compiled. See list at end of Lesson, p. 96).

But if in one statement Dr. Whately falls to the lowest, in another he towers to something above the highest, orthodoxy, curiously exemplifying its sliding and visionary scale. He is speaking of each church having been left to adopt its creeds, prayers and other forms, since there is "*only one short form of prayer for general use recorded,*" and he thus proceeds (Lesson v. p. 101):

* More properly '*to*' or '*into* the Name,' &c.

"And that one, having been taught by Jesus to his disciples *before* the great work of redemption had been accomplished, contains no allusion to Himself as the Redeemer. Accordingly, He afterwards tells his disciples, 'Hitherto ye have asked nothing of the Father *in my Name*: ask, and ye shall receive; that your joy may be full.' * * * * 'Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my Name, He will give it you.'"

Then in a note (after a reference to Hinds's History, p. 105, note on the scriptural use of the word "Name") we have this remark:

"Judging from the examples of the prayers recorded in Acts i. 24, and also in Acts vii. 59, it should seem that the earliest Christians understood their Master's injunctions to 'ask in his Name,' as authorizing them to direct their prayers *to Himself*, worshipping the Father in Christ Jesus."

The italics are not ours, but they might well have been even capital Romans to express our unmitigated surprise. Did the writer forget, or designedly omit (where his four asterisks are), "*In that day ye shall ask me nothing*," immediately preceding and in clear opposition to "Verily, verily, I say unto you" (also omitted), "whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my Name, He will give it you"? We suspect he *did* designedly omit these words, and that, their memory haunting him, he adduced the two plausible (and only plausible) instances of prayer to Christ by the apostles to support the perfectly gratuitous, unauthorized, nay, monstrous theory he professes to read in the mutilated words, which the presence of their antecedents would at once have explained without. Besides, "*asking in the Name of*" has a meaning of its own, and is not to be so summarily despoiled of it, least of all by these instances. In the former (Acts i. 24), although the word Lord, common to both God and Christ, is used (the passage is the prayer of the apostles on the election of a successor to Judas), yet there is another term added, viz., *knower or searcher of hearts*, which, by Peter in the council at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 8), is clearly used of God; and in the latter instance (Acts vii. 59), "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," Stephen was already (as he thought) in the *presence* of Jesus, whom he saw standing at the right hand of God; so Paul, in his vision, said (Acts ix. 5), "Who art thou, Lord?" Had Dr. Whately turned to Acts iv. 24—30, he would have found indisputable evidence on apostolic prayer; nor should he have forgotten, in respect of the two instances he has quoted, that the *apostles* (however he himself reads it) had heard Christ's *unbroken* direction on the subject in one breath, and so have interpreted them accordingly. Does he mean to deny that asking or doing in the name of Christ means "in behalf of," or "in the authority of," or "by the direction of"? And can he possibly mean to suggest, in the note cited above, that the earliest Christians, when *asking the Father in Christ's name*, actually worshiped the Father *by* or *under* Christ's name, and so made Christ not only God, but the Father? This is surely marvellous—an ultra orthodoxy—the beginning of a double modal Trinity—a mere theologic permutation and combination, destructive of all rationality, scripturalness and reverence. Yet such would appear to be the length to which false play with scripture insensibly leads. One wonders the mind does not recoil from its own creations. Yet arrived at this length (who would credit it?) the writer seriously says, "Appended to this Lesson will be found an attempt to adapt the LORD'S PRAYER to Christian use conformably to this view"! And here it is (p. 121). Who now are the improvers upon our Lord? Who they, that with audacious hand invade the covenant?

"Thou to whom all power is given,
Here on earth, above in heaven;
Jesus, Saviour, mighty Lord,
Be thy holy name adored.

In our hearts all-sovereign reign;
All the world be thy domain!
May redeemed man, we pray Thee,
Like th' angelic hosts obey Thee!

Thou who dost the ravens feed,
 Grant us all our bodies need ;
 Thou in whom we move and live,
 Daily grace sustaining give.
 Pardon us, our sins confessing,
 Keep us from afresh transgressing,
 May *we* pardon one another,
 As becomes a sinning brother.
 In temptation's dreadful hour,
 Shield us with thy gracious power ;
 From Satan's wiles our hearts defend,
 Saviour, Comforter and Friend !
 Glory to Thee on earth be given,
 Christ our King, the Lord of Heaven !
 Glory to Thee, great First and Last,
 When this world, and time, are past !"

Far away has the Archbishop here wandered from his *manifestation* theory ; and, besides making Christ assume the Father, invests him also as the Holy Ghost,—a step farther in the double combination mode.

There are a few other instances, both of more general and of this particular controversy (none, however, so notable as the above), in these Lessons on the History of Religious Worship, which abound, nevertheless, as do the other two little works we have noticed, with admirable good sense and just reflection. The Lessons on the History of Religious Worship have, appended to each chapter or lesson, a list of books from which it has been compiled, and among these Dr. Whately's larger works are conspicuous. They have also what many works of greater pretension sadly stand in need of, viz., a marginal abstract of matters treated of. The Lessons on the Evidences, and those on St. Paul's Epistles, have found a place on one or more of our Tract Societies' lists ; and, but for exceptions which we have pointed out, those on Religious Worship well deserve the same recommendation. We feel, indeed, that we cannot be too earnest in claiming the most serious attention alike to Christian Evidences, Scriptural Study and Religious Worship, in their essential and indissoluble mutual connection ; more especially as their recent depreciation has done, and we fear is doing, deep and extensive mischief in our churches, nor least among their younger members.

R.

The Maiden and Married Life of Mary Powell, afterwards Mistress Milton.
 London—Hall, Virtue & Co. Pp. 271.

THE composition of supposititious Diaries has been made unduly popular by the beauty and success of that of Lady Willoughby. Here we have what professes to be the Diary of Milton's first wife, Mary Powell, of Forest Hill, set off with all the antique beauty which the printer and the bookbinder can give. The author of this fictitious work possesses ingenuity, taste and considerable ideality, and does not lack that dramatic art by which the manners and language of a by-gone age are reproduced. In respect to acquaintance with the family history on which the Diary is founded, this author may be pronounced not deficient ; although it would be difficult to persuade us that the view taken of Milton and his young and uncongenial wife, and of her Cavalier family, is the correct one. The Diary is, in short, a very ingenious apology for Milton's runaway wife. The author has become too interested in the heroine of his story to give a dispassionate view of the case. The rough manners of an age of civil war will not bear the *rose-water* treatment of this writer. About the circumstances of Milton's marriage with Mary Powell there is, it must be admitted, some mystery. To us, the probability seems that it was suddenly consented to by the Powells in consequence of their inability to meet the pecuniary claim of the Milton family, and their

hope of advantage from the republican connections of their new relative. Their change of demeanour was, as Toland in his *Life of Milton* has hinted, coincident with the prospect of some success on the King's side, who then had his head-quarters at *Oxford*.

We share in Dr. Symmons' view of the Powell family when he calls them "proud and paltry." Mr. Todd, we know, considered this an "uncalled-for reflection" on a loyal family.

The writer of the *Diary* has, to make out a better case for Mrs. Milton, somewhat in violation of recorded facts, represented her as persuaded to leave London and her newly-married husband by a false statement of her father's illness, invented by her brother in order to remove her husband's natural objections. In the same spirit, too, the contumelious rejection of Milton's messenger is described as the work of the father alone, the daughter having neither share nor previous knowledge of it. Toland's words are on this point more definite than those of the later biographers of the poet: "She was invited by her friends to spend the rest of the summer in the country; to which he consented, on condition of her return by Michaelmas. Yet he saw her not at the time appointed; and after receiving several of his letters, without sending him any answer, she did at length positively refuse to come, dismissing his messenger with contempt."

Now for this part of the *Diary*:

"1643, Sept. 28.—A most displeased Letter from my Husband, minding me that my leave of absence hath expired, and that he likes not the messages he received through Ralph, nor the unreasonable and hurtful pastimes which he finds have been making my quiet Home distasteful. Asking are they suitable under circumstances of national consternation to *my owne* Party, or seemlie in soe young a Wife, apart from her Husband? To conclude, insisting with more Authoritie than Kindnesse, on my immediate Returne.

"With tears in my Eyes, I have been to my Father. I have tolde him I must goe. He sayth, Oh no, not yet. I persisted I must, my Husband was soe very angry. He rejoined, What, angry with my sweet *Moll*? and for spending a few Days with her old Father? Can it be? Hath it come to this already? I sayd, my Month had expired. He sayd, Nonsense, he had always asked me to stay over *Michaelmasse*, till his Birthday; he knew Dick had named it to Mr. *Milton*. I sayd, Mr. *Milton* had taken no Notice thereof, but had onlie granted me a Month. He grew peevish and said, 'Pooh,' 'pooh!' Thereat, after the silence of a Minute or two, I sayd yet agayn, I must goe. He took me by the two Wrists and sayd, 'Do you wish to go?' I burst into Teares, but made no Answer. He sayd, That is answer enough,—how doth this Puritan carry it with you, my Child? and snatched his Letter. I sayd, Oh, don't read that! and would have drawn it back; but *Father*, when heated, is impossible to controul; thereof quite deaf to entreaty, he would read the Letter, which was unfit for him in his chafed Mood; then, holding it at Arm's Length, and smiting it with his Fist,—Ha! and is it thus he dares address a Daughter of mine? (with words added, I dare not write)—but be quiet, *Moll*, be at peace, my Child; for he shall not have you back for awhile, even though he come to fetch you himself. The maddest thing I ever did was to give you to this Roundhead. He and *Roger Agnew* talked me over in soe many fine words. What possessed me, I know not. Your Mother always said evil would come of it. But as long as thy Father has a roof over his Head, Child, thou hast a Home.

"As soone as he would hear me, I begged him not to take on soe, for that I was not an unhappy Wife; but my Tears, he said, belied me; and indeed with Fear and Agitation, they flowed fast enough. But I said, I *must* goe home, and wished I had gone sooner, and would he let *Diggory* take me? No, he sayd, not a Man Jack on his Lande shoulde saddle a Horse for me, nor would he lend me one to carry me back to Mr. *Milton*; at the leaste not for a while, till he had come to Reason, and protested he was sorry for having writ to me so harshly.

"Soe be content, *Moll*, and make not two Enemies instead of one. Goe, help thy Mother with her clear-starching. Be happy whilst thou art here.' But ah! more easily said than done. Alle Joy is darkened; the Mirthe of the Land is gone!"

"Oct. 13.—The weather is soe foul that I am sure Mr. *Milton* would not like me to be on the Road, even would my Father let me goe.—While writing the above, heard very angrie Voices in the Court-yard, my Father's especiallie, louder than common; and distinguished the words 'Knave' and 'Varlet' and 'begone.' Lookt from my Window and beheld a Man, booted and cloaked, with two Horses, at the Gate, parleying with my Father, who stood in an offensive Attitude, and would not let him in. I could catch such fragments as, 'But, Sir!' 'What, in such weather as this?' 'Nay, it had not overcast when I started.' 'Tis foul enough now, then.' 'Let me but have speech of my Mistressse.' 'You cross not my Threshold.' 'Nay, Sir, if but to give her this Letter;' and turning his Head, I was advised of its being *Hubert*, old Mr. *Milton's* man; doubtless sent by my *Husband* to fetch me. Seeing my Father raise his Hand in angrie Action (his Riding-whip being in it), I hasted down as faste as I coulede, to prevent Mischiefe, as well as to get my Letter; but unhappilie, not so fleetlie as to see more than *Hubert's* flying Skirts as he galloped from the Gate, with the led Horse by the bridle; while my Father, flinging down the torne Letter, walked passionatelie away. I clasped my Hands, and stood mazed for a while—was then avised to piece the Letter, but could not, onlie making out such Words as 'Sweet Moll,' in my Husband's writing."

Our author draws a pleasing fancy-picture of the wise use to which Mrs. *Milton* put her adversity, and introduces Bishop *Jeremy Taylor* as aiding her in her wise resolves. The passage is a good specimen of the author's powers.

"Resolved to make the Circuit of the Cottages, but onlie reached the first, wherein I found poor *Nell* in such grief of Body and Mind, that I was avised to wait with her a long Time. Askt why she had not sent to us for Relief; was answered she had thought of doing soe, but was feared of making too free. After a lengthened Visitt, which seemed to relieve her Minde, and certaynlie relieved mine, I bade her Farewell, and at the Wicket met my Father coming up with a playn-favoured but scholarlike-looking reverend Man. He said, 'Moll, I could not thinke what had become of you.' I answered, I hoped I had not kept him waiting for Dinner—poor *Nell* had entertained me longer than I wisht, with the Catalogue of her Troubles. The Stranger, looking attentively at me, observed that may be the poor Woman had entertayned an Angel unawares; and added, 'Doubt not, Madam, we would rather await our Dinner than you should have curtayled your Message of Charity.' Hithertoe, my Father had not named this Gentleman to me; but now he said, 'Child, this is the Reverend Doctor *Jeremy Taylor*, Chaplain in Ordinarie to his Majesty, and whom you know I have heard more than once preach before the King since he abode in *Oxford*.' Thereon I made a lowly Reverence, and we walked homewards together. At first, he discoursed chiefly with my Father on the Troubles of the Times, and then he drew me into the Dialogue, in the Course of which I let fall a saying of Mr. *Agnew's* which drew from the reverend Gentleman a respectfule Looke I felt I no way deserved. Soe then I had to explain that the Saying was none of mine, and felt ashamed he should suppose me wiser than I was, especiallie as he commended my Modesty. But we progressed well, and he soon had the discourse all to himself, for Squire *Paice* came up and detained *Father*, while the Doctor and I walked on. * * How much I learnt in this short interview, for short it seemed, though it must have extended over a good half Hour. He said, 'Perhaps, young Lady, the Time may come when you shall find safer Solace in the Exercise of the Charities than of the Affections. Safer: for, not to consider how a successfule or unsuccessefule Passion for a human Being of like Infirmities with ourselves, oft stains and darkens and shortens the Current of Life,—even the chastened love of a Mother for her Child, and of *Octavia*, who swooned at *Tu Marcellus eris*,—or of Wives for their Husbands, as *Artemisia* and *Laodamia*, sometimes amounting to idolatry,—nay, the Love of Friend for Friend, while alle is sweet Influences and animating Transports, yet exceeding the Reasonableness of that of *David* for *Jonathan*, or of our blessed Lord for *St. John* and the family of *Lazarus*, may procure far more Torment than Profit; even if the Attachment is reciprocal and well grounded and equallie matcht, which often it is not. Then interpose human Tempers, and Chills and Heates, and Slyghtes fancied or intended, which make the vext Soule readie to wish it had never existed. How smalle a Thing is a human Heart! You might grasp it in your

little Hand; and yet its Strifes and Agonies are enough to distend a Skin that should cover the whole World! But in the Charities, what Peace! yea, they distill sweetnesse even from the Unthankfulle, blessing him that gives more than him that receives; while, in the Main, they are laid out at better Interest than our warmest Affections, and bring in a far richer Harvest of Love and Gratitude. Yet, let our Affections have their fitting Exercise too, staying ourselves with the Reflection, that there is greater Happinesse, after all things sayd, in loving than in being loved, save by the God of Love who first loved us, and that they who dwell in Love dwell in Him.'"

More "Papal Aggression" Pamphlets.

ON the evening of Friday, Jan. 24, Dr. Montgomery delivered in the Music Hall, Belfast, the first of a series of lectures on Christian Doctrine and Discipline. In order to attract the attendance, and to conciliate the religious feelings of other denominations, the proceedings were opened simply by the Lord's Prayer, in which it was supposed all could join, and after the lecture the service was closed with an apostolic benediction. Dr. Montgomery's sermon was a rapid summary of Christian doctrine and ecclesiastical history. As a popular address, calculated to set orthodox Christians thinking in the right direction, it deserves high praise. We are glad to see it in print, as another of the not small list of able controversial tracts suitable for popular circulation. At the close of the lecture, Dr. Montgomery states his opinions on the great topic of the day. They are, to a very great degree, in harmony with those of Lord John Russell; but of course no opinion is given of the precise measure by which the Government proposes to resist Papal aggression. As a liberal Irishman, Dr. Montgomery not unnaturally resents the conduct pursued by the Irish priesthood to their English protectors and benefactors. There is a mournful amount of truth in the following sketch:

"Previously to the year 1829, the Roman Catholics of Britain and Ireland laboured under grievous wrongs; but, in that year, the two Houses of Parliament, although exclusively Protestant, passed, by very great majorities, an Act of Emancipation, full, liberal, and satisfactory. That Act has, ever since, been carried out by every Whig Government in a just and manly spirit. Roman Catholics have enjoyed their full share—at least one-half—of all public offices, honours, and emoluments. On the Judgment-seat—in the Board of Education—and in all public trusts, they stand upon a perfect equality with their Protestant fellow-subjects. In Ireland, where Roman Catholics so much predominate in numbers, their bishops are not merely allowed titles of distinction, but take precedence of the ancient nobility of the land. For the education, mainly, of their working classes, a liberal system of National Education has been established: for the education of their clergy, the College of Maynooth, besides large sums expended in buildings, enjoys a grant of £30,000 a-year: and chiefly to educate their middle classes, the Queen's Colleges have lately been erected. Now, I do not say that these things demand a return of gratitude, but I do think they ought to have produced, at least, a reciprocity of kind feeling. What then *has been* the return? Why, the heaping of every foul epithet upon the Whigs, by their clergy and their press—the base abuse of the entire English people as murderers, immediately after sending some Eight Millions of money to feed our starving poor—the almost unanimous cry of priests and people for Repeal—and, above all, the decision of their bishops, at Thurles, in opposition to the Queen's Colleges, although every guarantee has been given against tampering with the religious opinions of any sect of students. This cannot be glossed over as a religious question: it is entirely secular; for every man in the community is interested in the proper education of Roman Catholics. And how was this assault upon education—this insult to our Parliament and Sovereign—brought about? Why, the Pope of Rome, a man abhorred by his own subjects and by all Italy—a miserable man who invited a French army to batter down 'the Eternal City,' and butcher his own children—a man kept upon the chair of Peter by infidel soldiers—this man, in defiance of the Irish clergy, sent over Dr. Cullen to rule the church, and to destroy the New Colleges, if he should not be permitted to rule them!"—Pp. 31, 32.

Because we agree with Lord John Russell and Dr. Montgomery in their opinion of the aggressive, usurping and essentially tyrannical character of the Church of Rome, we regret to see a Protestant people resorting to their unholy weapons. Let them meet Popish craft and insolence, not by Acts of Parliament, but by a thoroughly consistent Protestantism, by practically vindicating the sufficiency of scripture and the exercise and maintenance of the rights of private judgment. The penalties of Acts of Parliament Popery will evade; but well-tempered weapons like these it has never been able to withstand. Dr. Montgomery would seem to be persuaded of this when he admits that "the Established Church cannot fight Rome with her own weapons on her own field." But, instructed by the past history of the Church of England, can Dr. Montgomery place any faith in the sincerity of its attachment to "Religious Liberty"? We entertain the decided and very sad conviction that the Church of Rome itself does not contain grosser and more wanton intolerance than is habitually manifested by the clergy of the Church of England towards Dissenters. Dr. Montgomery says, as regards the position of his own church (the Unitarian church we presume he means), he is quite satisfied. "We care not that a Cardinal displayed his tinsel robes in every parish. He could make no impression," &c. Possessing this manly sentiment, we regret that Dr. Montgomery, with his powers of eloquent utterance and large and well-deserved influence, has not made it clear beyond dispute that he disapproves of the very paltry measure adopted by the Government.

From Mr. Carpenter's Oberlin press at Warrington, has issued a very sensible and scriptural defence of religious liberty, as opposed to the power of a priesthood and a church. It is "A Letter addressed to the Common People of the Roman Catholic Laity, by Emancipator." If strong scriptural arguments, adduced in a most friendly spirit, can move the Catholic laity, Emancipator will not address them in vain.

From Topsham we have received a series of "No-Popery" pamphlets by Mr. Goodwyn Barmby. When our readers remember that Topsham is in the diocese of Henry Bishop of Exeter, they will not wonder that Mr. Barmby directs a large portion of his thunder and lightning against the Popery of the Church of England. We agree with most of the sentiments, but cannot admire the style, which is disagreeably inflated.

A "Protestant Layman," who describes himself as a strenuous advocate of Catholic Emancipation as early as 1806, discourses on "The Duty of England," in reply to Cardinal Wiseman's Appeal. He admits the unquestionable right of the Roman Catholics of England to have a regularly-organized ecclesiastical hierarchy, if they desire it; nevertheless, he believes that their recent exercise of this right is calculated to injure the best interests of society, and ought to be opposed; and he maintains that the true mode of opposing it is by the diffusion of knowledge and rational religion. What the Layman's ideas of rational religion are, our readers will have no difficulty in gathering, when they observe his recommendation of "Mr. Chapman's publications," as the "best antidote to Roman Catholicism." But we would suggest to an experienced Layman that the means of cure are sometimes worse than the disease. We need not read many pages in the writings of Froude, Harriet Martineau and Mr. Atkinson, to find something far worse than Roman Catholicism.

Mr. Silas Henn has published his views of "The Romish Church," in a short tract. It states very plainly and sensibly the evil qualities of the Romish Church. Might not some concessions on the other side have been made? The religion of Fenelon and Francis Assisi was not, surely, all evil. Prelacy finds as little favour in Mr. Henn's eyes as Popery. He blames the Church of England for resisting human progress, for crippling the minds of its clergy, refusing to reform itself, and hindering the reforms attempted by others.

Pilgrimages to English Shrines. By Mrs. S. C. Hall. With Notes and Illustrations by F. W. Fairholt, F.S.A. Small 4to. Pp. 294. London—Hall, Virtue and Co.

ENGLAND may well be proud of its female writers, amongst whom, from Mrs. Somerville downwards, may be found admirable examples of every kind of talent, various knowledge, and skill in the author's craft. Amongst our popular authors, few write more gracefully and pleasantly than Mrs. S. C. Hall. There is a kindly spirit in her never tedious pages. The beautiful volume now before us is a charming specimen of mingled biography and topography. Its eighteen chapters, devoted to descriptions of the scenes consecrated by the genius or virtues of divines and poets, statesmen and philanthropists, painters and antiquarians, are enriched by nearly an hundred illustrations from the skilful pencil of Mr. Fairholt. The statement that many of these essays originally appeared in the *Art Journal*, is a voucher for the excellence of the illustrative engravings.

The first shrine to which the pilgrim's feet are directed, is, appropriately enough, to the birth-place of the immortal author of the *Pilgrim's Progress*. We have no sympathy with Mrs. Hall's conjecture, which she intimates is the opinion of those in Bedford with whom she conversed, that Bunyan's prison was not the little jail on Bedford Bridge, which had been originally a gate-house and part of the ancient fortifications of the town, but the county jail, concerning the site and appearance of which little or no tradition exists. There has been a tolerably uniform tradition that the town jail over the river Ouse was the place of Bunyan's confinement, and that in which he composed his immortal *Pilgrim*. Revered as Bunyan was in Bedford, where there has been a continuous succession of Nonconformists, we cannot believe there has been a mistake as to the place of his imprisonment. The jail stood till 1765, and many engravings of it have been published. That given by Mrs. Hall is copied from a view not published till May, 1783. A less definite, but probably more authentic wood-cut is given in Mr. Offor's edition of *Pilgrim's Progress*, published by the Hanserd Knollys Society. The view was taken in 1761, i.e. four years before the destruction of the building. The bridge was not pulled down till 1811. A curious relic was then discovered, which is supposed to have belonged to Bunyan, and to have been lost during his imprisonment, viz., a ring, with a Death's-head, MEMENTO MORI, and the letters I. B. inscribed or rather indented. This interesting relic is now in the possession of the Dean of Manchester, who supposes the ring to have been given to the prisoner by some wealthy friend, and the letters I. B. to have been indented by Bunyan himself. This relic does not settle the question, but it adds to the previous probabilities respecting the place of Bunyan's confinement.

We quote the description of the efforts of John Bunyan's wife to effect his release, into which our authoress has thrown the pure and fervid sympathy of a true woman's soul:

"The coronation of Charles took place on the 22nd of April, 1661, and when the next assizes came, Bunyan's wife presented a petition to the Judges that they would impartially take his case into consideration, and that he might be heard, and threw a second petition into the coach to Judge Twisden. It is not difficult to imagine the trembling but eager hand of the devoted wife flinging this entreaty at the Judge's feet, as he was preparing to descend from his carriage and proceed to 'the Swan Chamber.' Doubtless many in the crowd were filled with anxiety as to the result; and when, glancing his eyes over the contents, he told her that her husband was a convicted person, and could not be released unless he promised to preach no more, how must hope, strangled by despair, have expired within her bosom as she turned her eyes towards the prison, likely to become his tomb! Heaviness may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning. Elizabeth was so constituted as to be the worthy wife of the author of the '*Pilgrim's Progress*,' as well as the helpmate of John Bunyan, the tinker of Elstow. Sir Matthew Hale had expressed sympathy towards her, and the High Sheriff (whose memory for this one act deserves a record more

ennobling than his civic dignity) encouraged her to make another effort for her husband before the Judges left town; accordingly, with 'a bashed face and trembling heart,' she entered the 'Swan Chamber,' where the two Judges and many magistrates and gentry of the county were in company together. We wish that one of those artists who immortalize noble deeds with a true and vigorous pencil, would think of this as a subject worthy to be recorded—the quaint 'Swan Chamber,' its open windows admitting a view of the jail on the bridge and the heavy waters which passed slowly beneath this 'bridge of sighs;' the contrast between Judge Twisden and Sir Matthew Hale; the varied grouping and expression of the magistrates and gentry of the county; the Nonconformist's young wife, with a 'bashed face' and righteous purpose. Let it not be thought irreverent to the memory of one of the unsullied glories of England, the Lady Rachel Russell, if we remember that Lady Rachel craved to be her husband's secretary, but that Bunyan's wife, lowly born, lowly bred, but of lofty heart, became her husband's advocate. She had previously been in London to petition the House of Lords in his behalf, and one whom she called Lord Barkwood had told her that they could do nothing, but that his releasement was committed to those next assizes; and the assizes having come, she stood there to plead her husband's cause. The painter, as is his gift, could throw her soul into her face, and illustrate any one of her replies by that expression. 'I am come to you,' she said, 'and you give neither releasement nor relief;' and then, appealing to Sir Matthew Hale, she complained that her husband was detained unlawfully in prison, for the indictment was false, and he was imprisoned before there was any proclamation against the meetings. One of the Judges said he had been lawfully convicted; and thus aroused, she indignantly answered, '*It is false!*' and then reasoned why, according to her belief. 'Will your husband leave preaching?' said Judge Twisden; 'if he will do so, then send for him.' 'My Lord,' was her faithful reply, faithful to her God as to her husband—'My Lord, HE DARES NOT LEAVE PREACHING AS LONG AS HE CAN SPEAK.'"—Pp. 15—17.

The name of John Hampden is inscribed on the second shrine to which our authoress makes her pilgrimage. No Englishman can pass this chapter unread, or gaze without emotion at the pictorial illustrations of the village of Great Hampden, with an aged tree in its foreground that had heard the blast of Hampden's trumpet,—of Hampden's house,—of Great Hampden church, both in its exterior and interior,—of the house at Thame in which the Patriot breathed his dying prayer for his bleeding country,—and of the unworthy monument erected in Chalgrove field. Why does his descendant, the Bishop of Hereford, to whom this portion of Chalgrove field was recently allotted, allow this monument to be unfinished?

"In one of the reception-rooms (in the Hall at Great Hampden) is an interesting portrait, believed to be of the Patriot; it hung unnoticed on the stairs, until Lord Nugent undertook to exhume the remains of Hampden, with a view to ascertain whether he had died by the effect of the bursting of his own pistol, or from the shot of the carabine which, according to other historians, shattered the shoulder of the hero on Chalgrove field. The body, of which the grave was despoiled in a ruder manner and for a longer period than appears to have been at all necessary, was found perfect, *except that a shattered hand was rolled in a separate cerement beside it*: the features, when discovered, bore so strong a resemblance to this hitherto neglected portrait, that it was taken down and cleaned, and in a corner the name was discovered; it has since been placed in a worthier position."

We may not accompany our authoress in her pilgrimage to Barley Wood, in honour of Hannah More, though tempted by a view of the monument erected in the grounds to John Locke by Mrs. Montague; nor in those to the tombs of Gresham and Gray; nor in those to the birth-places of Chatterton and Richard Wilson. But we cannot pass "the House of Andrew Marvel," a quaint old cottage on the side of Highgate-hill, just facing Cromwell House, and next to that which once owned for its master the great Earl of Lauderdale.

"The genius of Andrew Marvel was as varied as it was remarkable; not only

was he a tender and exquisite poet, but entitled to stand *facile princeps* as an incorruptible patriot, the best of controversialists, and the leading prose wit of England. We have always considered him as the first of the 'sprightly runnings' of that brilliant stream of wit which will carry with it to the latest posterity the names of Swift, Steele and Addison. Before Marvel's time, to be witty was to be strained, forced and conceited; from him—whose memory consecrates that cottage—wit came sparkling forth, untouched by baser matter. It was worthy of him; its main feature was an open clearness. Detraction or jealousy cast no stain upon it; he turned aside in the midst of an exalted panegyric to Oliver Cromwell, to say the finest things that ever were said of Charles I."—P. 137.

At "the tomb of John Stow" our authoress discourses pleasantly on many antiquarian subjects. Take, as a specimen, the description of the *Alms-dish*:

"The prelates of the time of the Venerable Bede, having peradventure but wooden churches, had notwithstanding on their board, at meals, one *alms-dish*, into which was carved some good portion of meat out of every other dish brought on their table; all which was given to the poor, *besides the fragments left*. The rare lesson thus conveyed being, not that the '*fragments*' only were given to the poor—we are all ready enough to cast the '*fragments*,' when our hunger or our taste is satisfied, to the poor or to the dogs, caring little which, inasmuch as, being no longer needed, they become unpleasant—but the lesson was to have, as Christ said we must have, '*the poor always with us*,' and thus to provide for them, carving into the alms-dish, in the first instance, a portion of whatever was provided for ourselves. To our mind, this was a noble custom—a lesson of piety and Christian charity—a text and a sermon. Surely this was rendering our feasts a bond of love."—P. 152.

The subjects of the chapters which follow, are—the heart of Sir Nicolas Crispe; the printing-office of William Caxton; Shaftesbury House; the dwelling of James Barry; the residence of Dr. Isaac Watts; the prison of Lady Jane Grey; the town of John Kyrle; and the tomb of William Hogarth. Shaftesbury House, in the Fulham Road, once the residence of the author of the "Characteristics," now a poor-house of St. George's parish, has a peculiar interest from a tradition that in the summer-house in the garden Locke wrote some of his immortal works. Mrs. Hall is not unwilling to accept the tradition, so far as the "Third Letter on Toleration," the "Thoughts concerning Education," and his last controversial works, are concerned.

"The controversy with Bishop Stillingfleet might have been, it is fair to suppose, composed within those walls; and that, too, when the great philosopher was struggling with an asthma that tried the patience and piety of his powerful mind. Shaftesbury House was then a calm, silent, retired spot—apart from the bustle and business of life. The philosopher and his philosophic pupil were both sorely tried by sickness; and though there was over thirty years' difference in the dates of their birth, there was little more than nine in those of their departure. We felt it a high privilege to stand upon the old and worn-out stone that, black almost with age, is nearly embedded in the earth, at the entrance of this thrice-honoured ruin. Here, we may at least imagine, the young and the old philosopher exchanged thoughts; the former expressing himself in the most graceful language, while the latter concentrated his ideas until each word conveyed a thought worth gold; and yet, when you regarded them steadfastly, neither had the worn-out look attendant upon age. Their eyes brightened with that ever-living fire which is transferred, but never dies.—It might have been that Locke, seeing his kind friend and frequent attendant, Lady Masham, approaching with Lord Shaftesbury, hastened down to meet them, and received them here; that here she repeated the King's sorrow at his withdrawal from his appointment of Commissioner of Trade and Plantations, and the Royal hope that he would soon recover; and the lady, the beloved child of his old friend, Doctor Cudworth, smiled kindly and gently while she spoke, and looked imploringly into his face for the hope she had not, and he smiled also in return; but there was no untruth, no false hope, in that calm sad smile. He expressed his resolve not to hold a situation, to which a considerable salary was attached, without performing its duties; adding, that he would try perfect quiet in the country,

and employ himself entirely in the study of the Scripture, for that he felt he should not in this world have very long to live. And he would have said more but for the tears that overflowed the eyes of Lady Masham; and so he turned to ascend to his favourite room, his friends following; and as they went, Lord Shaftesbury may have murmured, 'And this is the end of our philosophy!'—Pp. 205, 206.

The quiet enthusiasm of our authoress for the great philosopher who wrote the "Essay on the Human Understanding" and the "Reasonableness of Christianity," is a pleasant contrast to the presumption of those who tell us that Locke is and will be unread, and that they who seek philosophy must go to the writings of Carlyle and Emerson. The "Essay on the Human Understanding" will be read, and the memory of its author revered, when the latter names are forgotten by all except some digger-up (the D'Israeli of a distant age) of the curiosities of the literature of the 19th century.

We cannot put aside this charming volume without another glance at the chapter devoted to Dr. Watts, and an extract or two from its page, glowing with reverence and love.

"On the right as you entered the hall" (at Abney Park), "was the small library which the poet and logician was permitted,—nay, that is too cold a word to express the noble hospitality exercised for *six-and-thirty* years towards the weak and quivering life of Isaac Watts,—was compelled, rather, by words and deeds of unchanging kindness, to call his own. We could not avoid picturing the little trembling man moving from that very door, bowing at every third step as he advanced to meet old Lady Huntingdon, who once came to greet him there, and saying, while offering his hand to conduct her into his library, 'Madam, I came to this hospitable house on a visit for three weeks, and I have remained here thirty and three years.' 'And,' added Lady Abney, curtsying with all the dignity of hoop and highly-mounted head, as suddenly she stepped forth from the small oak parlour, 'it is the shortest visit a friend ever paid.'" P. 234.

The father of Dr. Watts "suffered persecution for his religious opinions, and maintained his firmness in them as befits a Christian; for one of his son's biographers tells us a family tradition has recorded that, during his imprisonment, the youthful and sorrowing mother has been known to seat herself on the steps of her husband's prison-house, suckling this child of promise—this child cradled in meekness and controversial storms. The adversities of Isaac Watts' early years were remembered by him in after life, and doubtless originated that deep and ardent attachment to civil and religious liberty which marked his character, and led his muse to hail its establishment with exultation, when the dynasty of the vacillating Stuarts was driven from the throne."—Pp. 234, 235.

In her admiration of the sweet singer of Abney Park, Mrs. Hall follows Dr. Johnson. But the volume before us shews that she needs no learned authority to make her catholic in her sympathies and generous in her admiration to those whom bigots would "damn with faint praise," or pass by with a sneer. This is happily becoming the characteristic of the literary class in England. The principal exceptions to it are clergymen and ladies like Miss Strickland, in whom politico-religious bigotry has withered many of the generous sympathies of the heart.

Memoir of William Ellery Channing, with Selections from his Correspondence.
8vo. Pp. 535. London—E. T. Whitfield.

THE demand for another English reprint (the third) of Dr. Channing's Life, is an encouraging sign. It shews that there are readers interested in the opinions, character and life of this great and good man, beyond the pale of the Unitarian body. Mr. Whitfield has wisely put it into the octavo form, thus giving to those who possess the octavo edition of Dr. Channing's Works an opportunity of possessing an uniform copy of the Life. Some omissions of Dr. Channing's writings, which were too indiscriminately admitted into the

Memoir, have been made by the editor. We should have received with satisfaction the addition of some illustrative notes. Some portions of the Memoir need amplification, especially all that relates to the early growth and rapid diffusion of liberal theological opinions in America. From the numerous essays on the life of Channing which have appeared in English and American periodicals, some interesting extracts might have been gleaned. Perhaps in a future edition Mr. Whitfield may be induced to act on this suggestion.

Closet Prayers, original and compiled from the Writings of eminent and holy Men of various Churches. By Thomas Sadler, Ph.D. Pp. 189. London—Whitfield.

THE devotional compositions of Dr. Sadler have the all-important qualities of simplicity and fervour. Nearly one-half of the prayers in this neat little volume are original. The compiled prayers have been selected in a catholic spirit. Of them the author says,

“They are from members of the Church of Rome, the Church of England, and from Protestant Dissenters. I do not find the spirit of prayer and the power of giving living utterance to it, any more than God’s other choicest gifts, confined to one branch of Christ’s Universal Church. Those who seem to me to have been most successful, both in expressing and in calling forth the spirit’s holiest and loftiest breathings, are Jeremy Taylor, Fenelon, Thomas à Kempis, St. Augustine, Pascal and Leighton. I have therefore selected copiously, where I was able, from the rich treasures of their writings.”

On the Causes which hinder the Spread of Unitarian Christianity, and the best Means of fostering the Religious Life in our Churches; a Letter to the Churches of the Western Unitarian Christian Union. By the Rev. George Armstrong, B.A. London—Whitfield.

MR. ARMSTRONG’S earnest and almost apostolic letter deserves a much more elaborate notice than our space will at present permit us to give. We can only indicate the topics discussed by Mr. Armstrong, and trust they will recommend the Address itself to our readers’ attention.

In reviewing the *external* influences which are opposed to Unitarianism, he first names the wealth, power and patronage which the world arrays against it, and next the less corrupt hindrances of the temper of the law, and the general ignorance and prejudice of the people. In front of the more important internal hindrances, Mr. Armstrong names the want of sober, settled, earnest individual convictions and principles. He also names the want of united and energetic action, and the dread of sectarianism, leading almost to indifference to truth. He regrets the neglect in their homes of the doctrinal instruction of the young, and the deficiency in our churches of arrangements and institutions to arouse their interest and to preserve their adhesion. In speaking of the remedies of the evils and deficiencies of our condition, besides other and obvious means, he recommends the adoption of some ceremony of initiation into the church at years of discretion, not unlike in spirit, though of course widely different in form, to the Church rite of Confirmation. How he would protect individual religious liberty in the adoption of such a service, is not stated. He notices in passing the not unimportant agencies of doctrinal lectures, the circulation of tracts, and periodical pulpit exchanges. When he proceeds to recommend the adoption of a common Liturgy, “grounded on the model of, and with the least possible departure from, that in use of the Established Church,” he opens up a discussion on which Unitarians, individually and as independent churches, will hold and express very different opinions. We cannot regard this as matter of regret. We do not desire to see a stereotyped form of worship or of opinion fastened upon us. Mr. Armstrong thinks that an increased sense of unity would spring from the universal adoption of a Unitarian Liturgy. We would rather aim at the union of spirit, and are utterly indifferent about this union in the letter.

PERIODICALS.

The Working Man's Friend and Family Instructor. 16mo. Pp. 32. Published weekly. John Cassell, London.

THE working man, as he is technically called who earns his bread by dint of bodily toil, has always had abundance of professed friends and advisers. Interested parties without end have been found ready to take advantage of his weakness, his foibles, and even his generous confidence in their integrity. They have flattered and cajoled him, pandered to his vanity and prejudices, and dwelt with well-acted indignation on his wrongs, but seldom reminded him of his duties and his faults. Unfortunately for him, he has too often listened, approved, and been misled and betrayed. It is, however, a cheering feature of our times that men of intelligence, worth and enterprize, whose motives are above suspicion, are exerting themselves to supply wholesome instruction to the masses of our population.

Amongst such as these, the spirited proprietor of the "Working Man's Friend" deserves honourable mention. The object of this little, but very cheap periodical, is to aid the toiling millions of our country to improve themselves and their condition. For this it is, in the main, well adapted. In point of literary merits, it is not equal to Dickens' Household Words, or Chambers' Journal, but it is better suited to the class for which it is intended than either of them. Although, in some of its articles on political and social matters, there is, in the opinion of the writer of this notice, too much of haste and confidence, with perhaps a slight dash of quackery, yet on the whole, even on these subjects, the work is in advance of the classes to which it addresses itself, and well calculated to be instructive to them. It is free from that indiscriminate abuse of men in power, and that nauseous flattery of the multitude, which have characterized so many low-priced periodicals. In its selection of topics, it has been very successful. They generally have relation to its chief object, and are of a popular character; and when we add that Mr. and Mrs. Howitt, Miss Meteyard (Silverpen), Miss Rathbone, and other writers of note, are among the contributors, it will be readily believed that these topics are treated in an interesting manner.

There are two or three features of the work which are deserving of special mention. One of these is an admirable series of letters, bearing the signature of Martha Makepeace, on Household Economy. These are well adapted in style and manner to the working classes, and abound in good and seasonable counsels. A reprint of them, in a cheap form, would make a most excellent and useful tract. Another interesting and also a novel feature of this little periodical is the publication of a monthly Supplement, "devoted exclusively to contributions from the working classes." Ten of these have already appeared. They contain, amongst many others, articles on Music; the Education of Taste; the Dignity of Labour; Hero Worship; the Deism of skilled Workmen; the Intellectual Elevation of the Working Classes; the Mother's Mission; Eclecticism and its Relation to the Present Age; Physical and Moral Force contrasted; True Nobility; Poetry and the Poets; Home and its Endearments; Female Education; Machinery—its Advantages; Study of Natural Theology; Trades' Unions (against them); the Temperance Reformation; the Importance of Political Knowledge; the Crusades; and an Evening with Donne. Many of these papers are the productions of persons belonging to the humblest trades and avocations, and are very creditable to the abilities and feelings of their authors. Altogether they would form a unique volume, unprecedented perhaps in the annals of our literature, to which we might give the title of *Mind among the Workshops*—a fitting companion to a collection of American pieces published in one of Mr. Knight's Weekly Volumes, and called "*Mind among the Spindles*," in allusion to the factory operatives at Lowell by whom it was produced. These supplementary numbers will form an admirable manual for those who wish to make themselves

acquainted with the views and feelings of the *aristocracy* or *élite* of the operative classes. In addition to these means, Mr. Cassell has offered premiums of Ten Pounds each "for ten pithy sketches, tales or narratives, illustrative of the trials, sufferings and patient endurance of the industrial classes," and several of these have appeared in the *Working Man's Friend*. Another series of papers has pointed out the duties and means of self-culture and advancement, which demand the attention of the labouring orders. The work has just completed its fourth volume, and may be recommended to the numerous readers now to be found in humble life, and to all who take an interest in their struggles and improvement.

J. L.

Notes and Queries.—A second volume of this useful medium of intercommunication for literary men is completed, and contains much curious matter, suited to various tastes, which but for this novel periodical would probably never have seen the light. A few passages bearing on subjects appropriate to the *Christian Reformer*, we transplant into our own page.

In Vol. I., W. inquires respecting certain Lines on London Dissenting Ministers, composed by a daughter of the late Joseph Shrimpton, Esq., of High Wycombe. The verses circulated from 1782 to 1784, and compared the ministers named to certain productions of the vegetable world, and particularly to flowers.

"The *bouquet* is curious, nor ill selected and arranged. One individual, for example, finds his emblem in a *sweet-briar*, another in a *holly-hock*, and a third in a *tulip*. RICHARD WINTER, JEREMIAH JOYCE, HUGH WORTHINGTON, are parts of the fragrant, yet somewhat thorny and flaunting, nosegay."

In Vol. II. the querist adds,

"In the lines referred to, the late Rev. Thomas Tailor (of Carter Lane), whose voice was feeble and trembling, is thus spoken of:

"Tailor, tremulous as aspen leaves.

"But in verses afterwards circulated, if not printed, the censor was rebuked as follows:

"Nor tell of Tailor's trembling voice so weak,
While from his lips such charming accents break;
And every virtue, every Christian grace,
Within his bosom finds a ready place.

"No encomium could be more deserved, none more seasonably offered or more appropriately conveyed. I knew Mr. Tailor, and am pleased in cherishing recollections of him."

"Socinian Boast."

"In an allocution recently held by Dr. Pusey, to the London Church Union, in St. Martin's Hall, reported in *The Times* of Oct. 17, the following passage occurs: 'The Socinian boast might be a warning to us against such declarations. The Socinian pictured Calvin as carrying on the protest against Rome more vigorously than Luther, himself than Calvin:

Tota jacet Babylon; destruxit tecta Lutherus,
Calvinus muros, sed fundamenta Socinus.

"Query, By what Socinian writer are these two hexameter verses used?"

In reply, Dr. Beard, after a proper protest against the word *Socinian* (for which he substitutes "Unitarian"), states that "the distich appears to have been in use among the Polish Unitarians, shortly after the death of Faustus Socinus, as respectfully expressive of the exact effect which they conceived that he had produced in the religious world." Dr. Beard refers to Mr. Wallace's statement that the distich was an epitaph on Socinus, but inclines rather to the opinion that it formed part of a poem written as an eulogy on Socinus by some minister of the Unitarian church. Of the first line of the distich, Dr. Beard adduces two various readings, viz., *Alta ruit* Babylon, and *Tota ruet* Babylon. The latter is the reading of Bock (*Hist. Antitrinitariorum*, III. 725),

and expresses by its future tense the expectations of the followers of Socinus of the consequences of his doctrine.

Another correspondent (*R. Price, of Cheam*) quotes, in illustration of "the Socinian Boast," the lines of the Polish Knight, Samuel Przypciovius :

"Quid per Lutherum, Calvinum per que Socinum
Funditus eversam jam Babylona putas?
Perstat adhuc *Babylon*, et toto regnat in orbe
Sub vario primum nomine robur habens
Ostentat muros, jactat sublimia tecta
De *fundamento* quis metus esse potest?
Ni Deus hanc igetur molem disjecerit ipse
Humano nunquam Marte vel arte ruet."

The words in the third line, *Perstat adhuc Babylon*, would indicate that the verb in the original distich was in the present rather than the future tense.

In an earlier portion of the volume, a query respecting a MS. by Servetus, sold at Paris, 1725, in the library of Cisternay Dufay, is introduced with these eloquent remarks :

"The fate of Servetus has always excited the deepest commiseration. His death was a judicial crime, the rank offence of religious pride, personal hatred and religious fanaticism. It borrowed from Superstition its worst features, and offered Necessity, the tyrant's plea, for its excuse. Every detail of such events is of great interest. For by that immutability of mind which exists for ever as History, or through the agency of those successive causes which still link us to it by their effects, we are never separated from the PAST. There is also an eloquence in immaterial things which appeals to the heart through all ages. Is there a man who would enter unmoved the room in which Shakspeare was born, in which Dante dwelt, or see with indifference the desk at which Luther wrote, the porch beneath which Milton sat, or Sir Isaac Newton's study? So also the possession of a book once their own, still more of the MS. of a work by which great men won enduring fame, written in a great cause, for which they struggled and for which they suffered, seems to efface the lapse of centuries. We feel present before them. They are before us as living witnesses. Thus we see Servetus as, alone and on foot, he arrived at Geneva in 1553; the lake and the little inn, the 'Auberge de la Rose,' at which he stopped, re-appear pictured by the influence of local memory and imagination. From his confinement in the old prison near St. Peter's, to the court where he was accused, during the long and cruel trial, until the fatal eminence of Champel, every event arises before us, and the air is peopled with thick coming visions of the actors and sufferer in the dreadful scene. Who that has read the account of his death, has not heard, or seemed to hear, that shriek so high, so wild, alike for mercy and of dread despair, which, when the fire was kindled, burst above through smoke and flame,—'that the crowd fell back with a shudder'?"

We are precluded by the state of our columns from speaking this month of the *British Quarterly*, beyond adverting to an article containing an able and just tribute to the great merits of Mr. Kenrick's historical work on Egypt. Nor can we fulfil our purpose of reviewing the *Monthly Christian Spectator*, a cheap and liberal Nonconformist magazine of considerable promise. There is in the second No. the beginning of an article, penned with no small learning, on De Wette, to which, when concluded, we shall draw the attention of our readers. The *Sunday-School Magazine* continues its useful course, with, we think, increasing claims, from the religious spirit and varied topics of its monthly contents, on the support of the friends of the religious education of the poor.

OBITUARY.

Jan. 29, at his residence, 43, Bloomsbury Square, HENRY JOHN PRESTON, Esq. In the various relations of social and domestic life, he had acted his part well, and had obtained deservedly, so far as man's judgment can pronounce, the esteem and affection of a large circle of relatives and friends. Having acquired by honourable industry a handsome competence, he did not permit the charity which began, as it always should, at home, to end there; but regarded it as not less his pleasure than his duty to render aid, by personal co-operation as well as pecuniary contribution, to those benevolent institutions, the object and scope of which approved themselves to his sound judgment and kind heart. He was, accordingly, an active and influential, as well as an attached and earnest member of the religious society with which he had been connected for many years,—the congregation of Unitarian Christians assembling in Little Carter-Lane chapel, London. As a sincere lover of truth, he deemed it right to assist in the dissemination of those religious views which he regarded as rational, scriptural and practically important, and willingly exerted himself, therefore, in the promotion of the objects of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, of the Committee of which he was a valued and respected member. As one who believed that "love, out of a pure heart, a good conscience, and faith unfeigned, is the end of the commandment," he felt, if possible, a still livelier interest in the welfare of such institutions as are, in the true sense of the word, catholic as well as Christian; amongst which none excited a warmer or deeper interest in his mind than the London Domestic Mission. Of the value of this institution, as pursuing an object than which none can be more important,—the moral and spiritual welfare of the largest class of our fellow-men,—by the wisest means, he had formed the highest opinion, and by his zealous co-operation, from the period of its first establishment, strove to prove that he had. By his benevolent coadjutors in this and other works of love, his loss will be deeply felt. May his example inspire others with a holy emulation to supply it!

Feb. 4, ELIZABETH, wife of Mr. Ro-

bert CLEPHAN, of Stockton-upon-Tees, aged 71. Brought up in the Scotch Church, she became, early in her married life, an involuntary hearer of Unitarian doctrine, and was thus led to examine the foundations of her faith. Her inquiry ended in the adoption of Unitarian views, and to these she adhered through life with an intelligent and firm conviction. Her sphere was humble, but she adorned it by her virtues. The claims of a numerous family she faithfully discharged, at whatever sacrifice of ease and comfort; and she found time to cultivate, by reading and study, her strong, well-balanced mind, thereby the better fitting herself for the performance of her sacred duties. In the long illness which preceded her death, her favourite authors cheered her sick room. The passages which more peculiarly pleased her she committed to writing. The writer of this notice finds among her papers many scripture promises and other portions of Holy Writ, with extracts from Channing, Buckminster, Dewey, Aspland, Turner, &c., accompanied by such reflections as they had suggested to her mind. No longer able to attend the house of prayer in which she had worshipped for nearly half a century, she had copied, with especial emphasis, a "beautiful passage," in some degree applicable to her own condition, from the last discourse of Mr. Wicksteed in the Mill-Hill chapel. In a paper which she left behind her, addressed to one of her sons, encouraging him by precept, as she had ever done by her example, to the upright discharge of duty, and particularly to the preservation of that family love and union which was always near her heart, she said,—"It is a blessed mission to follow, at however humble a distance, in the footsteps of our blessed Lord, always remembering the 'cup of cold water' given in his name. * * * Oh, what an amount of blessings have I enjoyed! God grant that I may have felt grateful for them to Him, the Giver of all good! It will be a fearful account to render." And in this humble, grateful frame of mind, she calmly passed to her rest.

Feb. 1, JOHN JAMES, infant son of Mr. John Shepherd FLETCHER, surgeon, Manchester.